

[ISSUED SATURDAY, 1ST MAY, 1920.]



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

FIRST SESSION, 1920.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATE, 23 APRIL.		Tariff : Consideration by Senate	
Taxation of Totalisator Dividends	1480	Apportionment of Parliamentary Work : Public Service Bill	1516
Australian Imperial Force.—Soldiers' Memorials—Inscriptions on Soldiers' Monuments	1480	Public Service.—Mr. Justice Powers' Increments Award—Professional Officers' Award	1516
Passports Bill	1481	War Gratuity : Cashing of Bonds of Commonwealth Public Servants	1517
Aliens Registration Bill	1481	Internees.—Number of Australian-born and British-born—German Residents of Rabaul	1517
Printing Committee	1481	Immigration Bill	1517
Paper	1481	Passports Bill.—Second Reading	1518
Australian Imperial Force Canteens Funds Bill	1481	Aliens Registration Bill.—Second Reading	1518
Immigration Bill.—Second Reading	1481	Immigration Bill	1519
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 23 APRIL.		HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 28 APRIL.	
Public Works Committee	1486	Ministerial Statement : Business of Parliament	1530
Public Accounts Committee	1486	Record of Gunner Yates : Committee of Investigation	1531
Visit of the Prince of Wales : Additional Sitting Day	1487	Arbitration Court : Remarks by Mr. Justice Higgins	1532
Tariff Discussion	1487	Visit of the Prince of Wales : Newspaper Comments	1532
War Precautions Act	1487	Customs and Excise Report	1532
Anzac Tweed Industry	1487	Adjournment (Formal).—Anzac Hand-Weaving Industry	1532
Anzac Day	1487	Assistant Post Offices	1546
Post, and Telegraph Department : Allowance Post Offices	1488	Taxation of Wool-growers	1546
Naval Radio Service	1488	Australian-built Ships	1546
Sub-Collector of Customs, Broken Hill	1488	Tanunda Club	1546
Senior Cadet Trainees	1489	Commerce Regulation.—Copper Sheets and Plates	1546
Export of Superphosphates	1489	—Export of Foodstuffs	1547
Taxation.—Revenue from Absentees and Companies—Totalisator Dividends	1489	Tariff.—Harvesters—Wire Netting and Galvanized Iron—Iron and Steel	1547
Australian Imperial Force : Memorials to Fallen Tanunda Club	1490	Embargo on Imports	1547
Coal Supplies : Distribution in Victoria	1490	Manufacturers' Profits : Woollen Industry	1548
Agricultural Department Employees	1490	Papers	1548
War Service Homes : Operations of Commonwealth Bank	1490	Australian Notes Bill	1548
Central Wool Committee : Sale of Clips	1491	High Court Procedure Bill	1548
Papers	1491	War Precautions (Coal) Regulations Bill	1548
Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill	1491	Navigation Bill	1548
Third Reading	1515	Institute of Science and Industry Bill	1548
Australian Imperial Force Canteens Funds Bill	1516	Oil Agreement Bill	1548
Paper	1516	Patents, Trade Marks and Designs Bill	1548
Adjournment.—Order of Business	1516	War Gratuity Bill	1548
SENATE, 28 APRIL.		Mobilization and Vehicle Stores at Seymour : Reference to Public Works Committee	1549
Papers	1516	Australian Imperial Force Canteens Funds Bill.—Second Reading	1558
Public Works Committee	1516		
Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill	1516		

Exchange Duplicate, L. C. (Contents continued on Page 4 of Cover.)

PRICE, including Postage, 2s. 6d. per annum, or 2d. per number. Subscriptions should be sent to the Government Printer, Melbourne.

Dup.
U. of C.
Oh.

EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

FIRST SESSION.

Governor-General.

His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir RONALD CRAUFURD MUNRO FERGUSON, a Member of His Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Commonwealth of Australia.

Australian National Government.

(From 10th January, 1918.)

Prime Minister and Attorney-General	..	The Right Honorable William Morris Hughes, P.C., K.O.
Minister for the Navy	..	The Right Honorable Sir Joseph Cook, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Treasurer	..	The Right Honorable Lord Forrest, P.O., G.C.M.G.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Minister for Defence	..	The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C. (27th March, 1918).
Minister for Repatriation	..	The Honorable George Foster Pearce.
Minister for Works and Railways	..	The Honorable Edward Davis Millen.
		The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Minister for Home and Territories	..	The Honorable Littleton Ernest Groom (27th March, 1918).
		The Honorable Patrick McMahon Glynn, K.C. †††
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Minister for Trade and Customs	..	The Honorable Alexander Poynton (4th February, 1920).
		The Honorable Jens August Jensen.†
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C. (13th December, 1918).
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Postmaster-General	..	The Honorable Walter Massy Greene (17th January, 1919).
		The Honorable William Webster. †††
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Vice-President of the Executive Council	..	The Honorable George Henry Wise (4th February, 1920).
		The Honorable Littleton Ernest Groom.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Edward John Russell (27th March, 1918).
		The Honorable Edward John Russell.
		Appointed Vice-President of the Executive Council, 27th March, 1918.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Alexander Poynton.
		Appointed Minister for Home and Territories, 4th February, 1920.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable George Henry Wise.
		Appointed Postmaster-General, 4th February, 1920.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Walter Massy Greene.
		Appointed Minister for Trade and Customs, 17th January, 1919.*
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Richard Beaumont Orchard**
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Sir Granville de Laune Ryrie, K.C.M.G., O.B., V.D. ††
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable William Henry Laird Smith. ††

* Appointed 26th March, 1918.—† Removed from office, 13th December, 1918.—** Resigned office 31st January, 1919.—†† Appointed 4th February, 1920.—††† Resigned 3rd February, 1920.

Senators.

President—Senator the Honorable Thomas Givens.

Chairman of Committees—Senator John Wallace Shannon.

1 Bakhap, Thomas Jerome Kingston (T.)	Lynch, Hon. Patrick Joseph (W.A.)
Barker, Stephen (V.)	Maughan, William John Ryott (Q.)
Barnes, John (V.)	1 McDougall, Allan (N.S.W.)
Bolton, William Kinsey (V.)	Millen, Hon. Edward Davis (N.S.W.)
1 Buzacott, Richard (W.A.)	† Mulcahy, Hon. Edward (T.)
Crawford, Thomas William (Q.)	Needham, Edward (W.A.)
De Largie, Hon. Hugh (W.A.)	1 Newland, John (S.A.)
Earle, Hon. John (T.)	O'Keefe, Hon. David John (T.)
Fairbairn, George (V.)	O'Loughlin, Hon. James Vincent,
Ferricks, Myles Aloysius (Q.)	V.D. (S.A.)
Foll, Hattil Spencer (Q.)	Pearce, Hon. George Foster (W.A.)
Gardiner, Hon. Albert (N.S.W.)	Plain, William (V.)
Givens, Hon. Thomas (Q.)	Pratten, Herbert Edward (N.S.W.)
Grant, John (N.S.W.)	Reid, Matthew (Q.)
Guthrie, Robert Storrie (S.A.)	* Rowell, James, C.B. (S.A.)
Guy, James (T.)	Russell, Hon. Edward John (V.)
Henderson, George (W.A.)	Senior, William (S.A.)
Keating, Hon. John Henry (T.)	Shannon, John Wallace (S.A.)
* Long, Hon. James Joseph (T.)	Thomas, Hon. Josiah (N.S.W.)

1. Appointed Temporary Chairman of Committees, 26th February, 1920.—* Resignation reported, 20th December, 1918.

† Appointed by State Parliament, 15th January, 1919.—Sworn 26th June, 1919, and elected to fill vacancy, 13th December, 1919.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Let honorable members count the House out.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—We will, too.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I know you will.

Mr. TUDOR.—If the Minister plays that game, he will find honorable members on this side are able to do the same.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—And do not forget that the returned soldiers will know what you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Order! The honorable member for Yarra (Mr. Tudor), the honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page), and the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) are entirely out of order. I ask them to be silent.

Mr. WEST.—I hope the Minister is not going to lose his temper.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—All right. Go on with your "stone-wall."

Mr. MAHONY (Dalley) [11.8].—I hope the honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page) will agree to include the words "sailors" in his amendment.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Go on.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Yes, we will. I shall use all the forms of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page) is distinctly disorderly in uttering threats.

Mr. MAHONY.—I make an appeal on behalf of the men of the Australian Navy, and also those who served in the Imperial Navy. No member of this House has a more intimate knowledge of the effectiveness of their work in all parts of the world during the war than the honorable member for Wentworth (Mr. Marks), and I hope he will support the amendment with the addition suggested. We all realize that if it had not been for the naval defence Great Britain would have "gone down" in the war; and, therefore, I think we should include sailors within the scope of this provision. We recognise the good work the military side performed, but it would have been utterly impossible to convey our soldiers to Europe if it had not been for the equally good work of the Navy. It was the unceasing watchfulness and high sense of duty of our sailors that rendered the military defence effective. In praising our returned soldiers we are forgetting "Jack, the handy man in blue"—handy in both

peace and war. Our sailors suffered severely during the conflict, and many families are now bereaved by the loss of fathers, brothers, and sons; but the services thus rendered have not been recognised in any shape or form. I look to the honorable member for Wentworth, who spent some time amongst them, and did some good work himself in the North Sea and other parts, to raise his voice against an injustice being perpetuated. It is to be hoped that that honorable member's influence with the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) will result in a recognition of the claims I am now advocating. Our submarines also rendered great service along with other Australian-manned ships. Neither must we forget the wireless staff, which performed important duties, sending wireless messages of warning thousands of miles over the sea, and thus enabling our defenders to escape mine-fields, raiders, and so forth. It is the duty of every honorable member who has been in close touch with these men to see that their work receives due recognition. It is no use honorable members setting themselves up as the friends of certain branches or sections of our Defence Forces. The real test is their standing up in this House and by their actions showing that the services rendered have not been forgotten. I am not prepared to allow the honorable member for Wentworth to simply talk about his interest in the Navy, but require some tangible proof of that interest. I ask the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) to tell the Committee something of the good work done by the wireless staff, in order that they may receive some recognition.

The CHAIRMAN (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Order! I again direct the attention of the honorable member to the fact that the actions of the honorable members for Wentworth and Parkes are not before the Committee.

Mr. MAHONY.—If the Minister is prepared to give me leave to continue my remarks to-morrow I might then be able to confine them to matters that will be in order.

Mr. POYNTON.—I want to get some work done.

Mr. RYAN.—It is open to the honorable member to move the Chairman out of the chair.

Mr. MAHONY.—Then I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the chair and report progress.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	28

Majority	13
-------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Blakeley, A.
Catts, J. H.
Fenton, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Mahony, W. G.
Makin, N. J. O.
Moloney, Parker

Riley, E.
Ryan, T. J.
Stewart, P. G.
Tudor, F. G.
West, J. E.
Tellers:
Mathews, J.
Page, James

NOES.

Atkinson, L.
Bell, G. J.
Blundell, R. P.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Corser, E. B. C.
Foster, Richard
Francis, F. H.
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Groom, L. E.
Hill, W. C.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.

Kerby, E. T. J.
Lister, J. H.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Wiernholt, A.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Minister for the Navy) [11.28].—I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

In doing so, I should like to say that I hope we shall get the Bill through to-morrow. The only thought I have had—

The CHAIRMAN. — Order! The honorable gentleman may not debate the motion.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Progress reported.

WAR GRATUITY BILL.

Bill returned from the Senate with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Minister for the Navy) [11.30].—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

I merely desire to express the hope that honorable members will pass the Repatriation Bill to-morrow.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—It will not pass if I can prevent it. You made me miss my tram to-night, and I will make you miss your train to-morrow. I will pay you out!

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The position is this—

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—That is the position so far as I am concerned. I promise you.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I will be glad if the honorable member will let me speak, unless he is going to take charge of the House altogether.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—I do not want to take charge. The Minister wants to take charge of me.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—We have got through twenty-four clauses of the Bill. There are about forty more to be dealt with, besides the schedules, and the only thought in my mind is to get a little forward with the measure. This has been a lost day so far as business is concerned, and I thought it not unreasonable that we should proceed some distance with this very important measure. It appears, however, that I was wrong in entertaining any such reasonable idea. I again appeal to honorable members to assist the Government to get the Bill through to-morrow. It is urgent. The returned soldiers concerned are waiting for it, and no one desires to do other than the best thing possible in regard to those who are to receive benefits under this measure. However, to pass the Bill to-morrow we shall have to get a head of steam up, which, apparently, we have not been able to do throughout this week. I confess to being very disappointed.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.33].—The Minister for the Navy is unreasonable when he makes such a confession. He has spoken of to-day having been wasted. What was the day wasted on? Upon two motions submitted by honorable

members on the Government side, who occupied the whole of the time, up to the dinner adjournment.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—And mighty important matters they were!

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—That is not what your Minister calls them.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister for the Navy has just said that the time of the House was wasted.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I defy the honorable member to find the word "wasted" in anything I have said. I said no such thing.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister stated that we had done nothing to-day.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I said you had done no Government business to-day. Will you try to be accurate for once?

Mr. TUDOR.—There is no need to talk like that. I can assure the Minister that this is not the way to get business passed. Honorable members on this side have some rights.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—We have none where the Minister for the Navy is concerned.

Mr. TUDOR.—We may be few in number, and may be liable to suffer by the closure.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Who has said that we have closed you?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—You are not game to try.

Mr. TUDOR.—I hope the Government will not closure us, and I do not think it will be necessary to do so. With respect to the Repatriation Bill, we are as keenly interested in its passage as honorable members opposite. The question is not with respect to the number of clauses. It is a matter of principles, and there are three main principles involved. First, there is the appointment of the Commission, then there is the appointment of the Boards, and, thirdly, there is the matter of pensions. The Government have got past all three of those principles. The remainder of the Bill could be dealt with in half-an-hour.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—You will not get it in half-an-hour to-morrow.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister in charge of the Bill asked me this evening, in the matter of the business which I was to bring before the House when moving an

amendment upon the grievance day motion—a procedure often adopted, by the way—whether I would be agreeable to hurry, so that honorable members might be free to deal with the Repatriation Bill. There were several honorable members upon this side who had prepared speeches, but they agreed not to occupy time in talking, in order that the way might be cleared for the consideration of the Repatriation Bill. The honorable member for Cook (Mr. J. H. Catts) and the honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page) had prepared remarks in connexion with the motion dealing with Gunner Yates. I personally spoke to every honorable member on this side, with the idea that we should agree to hurry forward our business, in order to let the Government get to its Bill. Moreover, the Government Whip informed us that the Ministry had agreed, in the event of our making way as rapidly as possible, to adjourn at 11 o'clock.

Mr. POYNTON.—The Whip had no authority to make such an intimation.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Still, the net result of the night's work upon the Bill is the passage of one clause.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes, the last contentious clause in the Bill. However, I have no intention of delaying honorable members at this late hour, and I do not desire to participate in another all-night sitting during the remainder of my association with this Parliament, if I can avoid it. I believe I hold the unenviable record of having taken part in more all-night sittings than any other honorable member.

Mr. POYNTON.—I might be inclined to challenge that assertion; but all I asked for was that the Committee should get through with that portion of the Bill dealing with pensions.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is to say, with twenty-one clauses. My own desire is that the Bill shall be agreed to at the earliest possible moment. I promise that, for my part, that shall be brought about; and, as honorable members know, I have never gone back on any promise.

Mr. JAMES PAGE (Maranoa) [11.37].—Both the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) and I tried to curtail discussion with regard to the motion concerning

Gunner Yates, in order that the Government might be free, at the earliest possible moment, to bring forward their business. We were informed that if we did facilitate Government business the House would be adjourned at 11 o'clock. When the Government secured a decision upon the pensions section of the Bill, I expected that the promise to adjourn would have been kept. All I can say is that if the Government had kept their promise, this Bill would go through to-morrow. But I warn the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) that he will not witness the final passage of the measure unless he is prepared to sit here to-morrow night. He succeeded in preventing me from catching my train this evening, and I will undertake to stop him from getting on board his train to-morrow. There would have been no waste of time after the House had begun work at 8 o'clock to-night but for what the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) said a little time ago about former members of the Opposition who had gone to the war.

Mr. PROWSE.—We should sit another day a week.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—We should sit every day, and Sundays as well, and then we would be able to secure "double time" for our services.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 11.39 p.m.

Senate.

Friday, 23 April, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

TAXATION OF TOTALISATOR DIVIDENDS.

Senator GARDINER.—I ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate if his attention has been drawn to the statement that it is the intention of the Commissioner for Taxation to tax totalisator dividends as lottery prizes? Will the Government give that gentleman a holiday to attend several race meetings to obtain some idea of how the totalisator works, so that he may not waste Government money attempting to tax moneys Lottery?

Senator MILLEN.—A great deal of the honorable senator's question is in the form of assertions, which I feel that the Standing Orders would not permit me to discuss at this time, as I should like to do. I have seen the statement referred to by the honorable senator, and I understand that the Commissioner of Taxation has exercised an authority which the Income Tax Act gives him.

Senator GARDINER.—Will the Minister, before the Senate rises to-day, look up the section of the Income Tax Act and see whether in any sense of the word a totalisator can be called a lottery?

Senator MILLEN.—I have not much knowledge of the subject to which the honorable senator refers, but I assume that Senator Gardiner has. The real point, however, is whether the Act gives the Commissioner for Taxation power to do as he has done.

Senator GARDINER.—No; none whatever.

Senator MILLEN.—That is the whole point involved in this matter, and, as I understand the position, the Commissioner for Taxation has full power to take the action he has decided to take.

Senator GARDINER.—This is a matter of importance, and I ask the Minister whether he realizes that the Government are responsible for the protection of the public funds, and that if the Commissioner for Taxation institutes proceedings for the recovery of taxation upon moneys that are obviously not prizes in a lottery, a glaring mistake will be made.

Senator MILLEN.—I am not able to say whether a mistake is being made or not. It is not my function to decide that. But if by his question the honorable senator wishes to ask whether the Government will consider the matter, my answer to that will be "Yes."

Senator GARDINER.—Thank you; that is the question which really I ought to have asked in the first place.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE.

SOLDIERS' MEMORIALS—INSCRIPTIONS ON SOLDIERS' MONUMENTS.

Senator GARDINER asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate, *upon notice*—

1. With regard to soldiers' memorials wrought in stone, is it the intention of the Government to have these made in Australia

by Australian workmen, or is it their intention to import same from Italy?

2. Will the Government cause inquiries to be made into the merits of Australian workmanship before this work is sent outside Australia?

Senator MILLEN.—The question of the erection of memorials to commemorate the deeds of the Australian Imperial Force is being considered by the Government, and it is hoped to make a pronouncement at an early date.

Senator GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

Is it a fact that the Minister for Defence has issued a circular asking relatives of soldiers killed on active service to subscribe to monuments erected in France to their memory?

Senator PEARCE.—The answer is—

No; the expenditure on war cemeteries and the maintenance of graves with appropriate headstones is being borne by the Government.

It was felt that it was inadvisable to leave the provision of headstones to private initiative, it being the sacred obligation of the Empire to preserve the graves and maintain suitable memorials upon them. At the same time it was difficult to resist the natural desire of many relatives to be personally associated in some way with these memorials of their deceased kinsmen. The most appropriate way of meeting such desire was, in the opinion of the Imperial War Graves Commission, to allow a short inscription to be added on the application of the next of kin, or other person, or organization, and at a slight expense to the applicant.

PASSPORTS BILL.

Bill presented, and (on motion by Senator RUSSELL) read a first time.

ALIENS REGISTRATION BILL.

Bill presented, and (on motion by Senator RUSSELL) read a first time.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Motion (by Senator NEWLAND) agreed to—

That the report from the Printing Committee, presented to the Senate on 22nd April, 1920, be adopted.

PAPER.

The following paper was presented:—

Customs Act—Regulations Amended—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 50, No. 55.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE CANTEENS FUNDS BILL.

Report adopted.

Standing and Sessional Orders suspended, and Bill read a third time.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 25th March (*vide* page 788), on motion by Senator RUSSELL—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [11.10].—I intend to speak very briefly on this Bill, which to me is most objectionable. We have gone through a period of five years of war legislation, and under this Bill it is proposed to continue that legislation. Peace has been declared amongst most of the nations of the world, except, apparently, so far as the Australian Government is concerned. This Bill embodies the worst features of the legislation by regulation which was carried on by this Government during war time. There is one clause of the measure under which the Government propose to prohibit the immigration into the Commonwealth of—

Any anarchist or person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth, or of any State, or of any other civilized country.

Let us consider what would have been the effect of the operation of such a provision in other countries in the past. It would have excluded from England a man like Cromwell, who did work for which those who love the liberty of their country bless his name. It would have excluded from America a man like Washington, whose name is blessed the world over, because he persisted in overthrowing a Government by force. It would have excluded from the countries in which they lived all those people who were responsible for the great revolutions which have done so much for the human race. That is sufficient to sum up the opposition with which measures of this kind should be met.

What is an "anarchist"? The man who is called an anarchist to-day is recognised as a statesman to-morrow. I refer honorable senators to the history of New South Wales and the action taken by Sir Henry Parkes, who told the British Government that if they did not cease to send convicts to New South Wales the people would throw them back into the harbor. The newspapers next morning branded him as the "arch-anarchist Parkes." Again, when the Chinese Immigration Restriction Act was passed, and the Secretary of State for the

Colonies—I think, Lord Knutsford—wrote to Sir Henry Parkes to say that the Act was not in accordance with British treaties, his reply was one that should be remembered by all. He said, “Then let the British Government alter their treaties or Australia will make its own.”

Under this Bill a man may be dubbed an anarchist because he has principles and the courage to make them known, and may be prevented from landing in Australia. I say let the Government try to prevent it. Whether the Government try to stop that kind of thing going on or not, Governments will be overturned in Australia before very long. The present Government are sowing the seeds of the force that will overturn Governments as at present constituted. We are within easy distance of a republican form of government in Australia. Honorable senators opposite may not notice the trend of events, and the effect of this repressive legislation to do by force what it should be left to the common sense of the community to do. This kind of legislation, and I am very glad to see it, is bringing us within measurable distance of the time when Australia will be governed by Australians elected as the people of this country desire.

I have been continually pointing this out. I am continually warning the Government and raising my voice against the petty pin-pricking legislation which is irritating every one. I say that we are within easy reach of a republican form of government in Australia. Honorable senators opposite may think that that is an astounding statement to make, but repressive legislation of this kind, and such as the War Precautions Act, has done more than anything else to weaken the desire of the Australian people for a system of government based on law and order. I know that honorable senators opposite will say that I was a member of the Government which introduced the War Precautions Act. That is so, but I never dreamed that that measure would be used as it has been. The power to legislate by regulation was exercised in a way in which it never should have been exercised, and it irritated the whole community. Here is a Bill under which the Government, losing the grip of their power to legislate by regulation, are going to decide who is an anarchist. Imagine some well-known representative

Senator Gardiner.

of Labour—a man, for instance, like Phillip Snowden—coming to this country. The Government decide that he is an anarchist—

Senator RUSSELL.—It would not be sufficient to declare him an anarchist; it would be necessary to prove that he was in favour of using force.

Senator GARDINER.—What would be regarded as proof? I was one of those who assumed that the War Precautions Act was a piece of emergency legislation to be used to protect Australia against its enemies. I have lived to see it used for the purpose of suppressing Australian sentiment. For six years we have had a Government that, during war, used the War Precautions Act, deliberately passed by this Parliament for the protection of Australian interests against the Empire's enemies, in a manner calculated to do injury to our people. In fact, they used it to rob the Australian producers, so there can be no concessions to a Government capable of governing Australia on those lines. The brightest pages in the history of the human race have been written by those men, some of them termed revolutionaries, who dared to stand up on behalf of the people against the tyranny of constituted authority. And so it will be always. In every country where progressive thought holds sway, the old forms of government must decay. We are living in a time of decaying systems of government, some of which are rotten to the core; and an intelligent Democracy, if called upon, will not fail to use force to crumple them up.

Senator GUTHRIE.—What about the conditions in Russia?

Senator GARDINER.—The people there had to use force to remove the old Russian Government.

Senator SHANNON.—Their second state is worse than their first.

Senator GARDINER.—Nothing could have been worse than the conditions of the Russian people under Czardom; but a people cannot turn out even the most rotten form of government without force, and doing things which, in normal times, ordinary men and women would shudder at. But, unless I am mistaken in my view, Russia is about to lead the world in making the conditions of life better than they have ever been before. The terrible bloodshed in that country was a result,

not of the revolution, but of the counter-revolution in the interests of the old system of government, and with the object of putting the Czar on the throne again. Mr. Bullitt, an American Commissioner, whom I have already quoted in this Senate, has said that in the first two years of the revolution the revolutionary Government were doing all they could to uplift the masses.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—They had a strange way of doing it.

Senator GARDINER.—It may have appeared strange, but drastic action had to be taken to rid the people of the old rotten system of government; but in the first two years the new Government were moving in the right direction, for we have it on the authority of Mr. Bullitt that schools were established in the palaces of the wealthy, and education was being brought to the workers and their children. It cannot be expected, of course, that an ideal nation can be built up in two years, but a very good idea of the future may be gained if we see the builders at work, and know that they are travelling the proper road, taking, as in the case of Russia, the children first. Mr. Bullitt has told us that all the best of the food was being reserved for the Russian children. It must be remembered that the Allied blockade had made food very scarce in Russia, and the American Commissioner stated that a prominent revolutionary had declared he would gladly starve another year for the revolution, because the next generation would benefit. Can honorable senators say that any man would be guilty of a crime in trying to overturn such a system of government as existed in Russia for so many years?

Senator ROWELL.—Did you read the statement made by Colonel Ward, one of the members of the House of Commons, about the conditions in Russia?

Senator GARDINER.—No, but I shall be pleased if the honorable senator will put that evidence on record. I am putting the side which I have read, and quoting what I regard as an impartial authority. If any other honorable senator has a more impartial authority, then I shall be glad to have the evidence. My point is that under this Bill any Russian who participated in the overthrow of the old

Russian form of government will be prevented from entering the Commonwealth, and among those who took part in that revolution are numbered some of the most brilliant students of the Russian universities. We have to give this matter very serious thought in Australia, for we have Ministers in power who imagine that they can go on flouting the people, faking elections, and calling it government. Australia has got tired of it. I warn the Government that restrictive legislation of this nature leads to disaster. I tell them this plainly. We have had in this country many distinguished men with their own ideas as to the true form of an Australian government. John Dunmore Lang, for instance, had no hesitation in expressing his appreciation of the republican system. No level-headed, fair-minded man can come to any other conclusion.

Senator RUSSELL.—This Bill will not prevent the entry of any man who favours a republican form of government.

Senator GARDINER.—It will prevent the entry of men who took part in the overthrow of the Russian Government.

Senator RUSSELL.—By force. But surely the honorable senator is not comparing the conditions in Australia with those of Russia.

Senator GARDINER.—I am endeavouring to show that the Government are introducing Russian conditions here, and I tell the Minister that all legislation that interferes with the liberty of the people will have my strongest opposition.

Senator RUSSELL.—The people of Australia, in the franchise, possess a more effective weapon than is in the hands of the Russian people, even after the use of force there.

Senator GARDINER.—But when that weapon has been taken away from them by fraud, they may be driven to force. Personally, I never favour force, not because it is not necessary at times, but because I realize that any case resting exclusively on force is doomed. Force can only be employed effectively when behind it is the moral support of the majority of the nation. This Bill to restrict the liberty of the people is repugnant to their sense of justice. The Prime Minister of Great Britain (Mr. Lloyd George) has admitted that since the war thought in England has at times been in the direction of revolution.

Senator SHANNON.—Do you not think that the kind of speech you are now making will encourage it?

Senator GARDINER.—I hope it will, because, so far as I am concerned, I have nothing to fear. Measures like that now under consideration do not make for freedom; they breed revoltion. The possession of liberty does not turn people's thoughts towards revolution, but when their liberties are being restricted, when they are harassed and annoyed, it is inevitable that their thoughts should turn in that direction. The Government want revenue. And what are they doing? They tax the working classes in the name of Protection. They pass an Income Tax Bill, and say that a married man shall be exempt from certain payments in proportion to the number of children he has to maintain; but in their Protective Tariff they say to the married man that his tax shall be high in proportion to the number of members in his family.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens).—Order! The honorable senator is not entitled to discuss the Tariff on this measure.

Senator GARDINER.—I am merely using the Tariff as an illustration. Surely I am allowed to do that? You always manage to interfere with me.

The PRESIDENT.—I did allow the honorable senator to use the Tariff as an illustration; but he must not debate the Tariff.

Senator GARDINER.—If I cannot use the Tariff as an illustration in my own way, I shall not continue.

Senator FAIRBAIRN (Victoria) [11.27].—I am sorry Senator Gardiner has seen fit to leave the chamber, because I wanted to draw his attention to one or two points which he appears to have overlooked. The Bill under consideration seeks to prohibit the entry into Australia of—

Any anarchist or person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established Government of the Commonwealth, or of any State, or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law, or who is opposed to organized government, or who advocates the assassination of public officials, or who advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, or who is a member of, or affiliated with, any organization which entertains and teaches any of the doctrines and practices specified in this paragraph.

It is entirely reasonable to exclude such disturbing elements from our community. The honorable senator who has retired from the chamber is always saying that he deplores the use of force, but I think his speeches are usually calculated to encourage force, and, if he were here now, I would not mind telling him so. He has endeavoured to show that men like Washington would, under this Bill, be prevented from entering the Commonwealth, because he headed a revolution which, it is now admitted on all sides, was perfectly justified. But what are the descendants of Washington, and men like him, doing to-day in their fight for freedom in the United States of America? What are they doing but sending these disturbing elements out of their country into Mexico? I could quite understand that there would be a danger of revolution in times of peace if we attempted to govern this country under the War Precautions Act; but we have now returned to a proper constitutional form of government, in which every single man and woman in the Commonwealth above the age of twenty-one years has an equal share. That, in my opinion, is the only possible way of governing any civilized country. It is imbecile and childish to suggest that people who hold extreme doctrines, which Senator Gardiner says he so much deplores, should be allowed to enter the Commonwealth and interfere with our splendid system of government. If, as he has been endeavouring to show, the Russian system of government is so splendid, then there can be no hardship in requiring those people, who may have taken part in the upheaval there, to return to Russia. I hope the Senate will pass the Bill. People who come to Australia know that they have to obey the laws of the land and abide by majority rule, and in the interests of good government some such measure as this is necessary.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [11.31].—I indorse all that Senator Fairbairn has said, and I regret that Senator Gardiner has not remained in the chamber to take his gruellng as any other sporting man taking part in a debate would have done. I think that Senator Fairbairn struck the right note when he compared the conditions in Australia with those of other countries, particularly Russia. During recent years

there have been quite a number of people in Australia who have endeavoured to turn the freedom they have been permitted to enjoy into licence, and the Government are therefore fully justified in introducing this Bill. In commenting on Cromwell and Washington, Senator Gardiner loses sight of the fact that we are now living in an age where every adult has a voice in the government of the country; and his comparison with Russia was a most unfortunate one. Quite apart from the fact that every man or woman in the Commonwealth over twenty-one years of age has a vote, they also have the opportunity, if they have sufficient support, of taking part in the framing of the laws under which they live. From time to time it has been the practice for Senator Gardiner to sneer at those who were not privileged to be born in Australia, and he has at times referred to those who came from Great Britain as imported immigrants. According to the honorable senator, Phillip Snowden and other Labour leaders would not have the opportunity of entering Australia if this Bill became law; but he should remember that when the two French Labour delegates visited Australia the people of Australia, and a National Government, welcomed them with open arms. The only opposition with which they met came from the trade unionists at the Trades Hall in Sydney, where they were howled down by these so-called Democrats whom Senator Gardiner represents.

Senator SENIOR.—They came from a revolutionized people.

Senator FOLL.—Exactly. The Government are to be congratulated on the stand they have taken. When we consider the liberties we enjoy under a popular system of government, it is ridiculous for Senator Gardiner to compare the conditions in Russia with those prevailing in Australia.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [11:35].—Glancing through the Bill, I fail to see any basis for the remarks of Senator Gardiner. When he compares Australia with Russia and says that the Government of Australia is rotten, he is inferring that the people of Australia, who elected the Government, are devoid of brains, and he, as an elector, must be included. The honorable senator, who is a believer in majority rule, now accuses the majority of not knowing its

own business, and he has not thought where his reasoning would lead him. He must remember that the people of Russia are uneducated, whereas in Australia the children have better opportunities of learning than men of to-day possessed fifty years ago. There is an idea in the minds of some people that evils can be remedied only by drastic means; but if the world is to move forward and the people are to progress, it must be by the law of evolution, and not by revolutionary methods. History has not shown a single instance where progress has been made by leaps and bounds. Every opportunity should be given for the expression of thought, and so long as individuals are governed by reason and good judgment, legislation of this character cannot be regarded as repressive. If we are to give way to passion, and disregard the rights of others, and what is best for the world, force must necessarily be employed. That would not be in the interests of Australia and the world generally. The proposed legislation has been found necessary in consequence of our experience during the war period, and the Bill has my support.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [11:40].—I am naturally surprised at the statements made by Senator Gardiner, because he gave the impression that the Bill would prevent men from holding certain beliefs or supporting certain principles. The measure is not designed for that purpose, and if a hot-headed Tory favoured the suppression of the working class by military force it would affect him just as much as any one else. I remember the time in Australia when the workers were fearful of the fact that military force might be employed to suppress the rights of Democracy, and I, for one, would at all times strongly oppose anything of that nature. Supposing, for instance, we had a Government establishing Labour principles, and that the chairman of a Chamber of Commerce advocated the breaking up of industrial unions, the provisions of the measure would apply. Reference has been made to Cromwell and Washington, but Washington did not use force in the interests of democratic control until others had first done so. The fact that a Russian was opposed to the late Czar and his form of government would not prevent him coming to Australia; but

there are possibilities of abuses on both sides. If, however, such men were to come to Australia, and as a result of their efforts the community was likely to suffer, the law would have effect. This Bill does not in any way interfere with the right of any man to express his beliefs, but such a person must not endeavour to secure control by force.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 (Prohibited immigrants).

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [11.46].—As honorable senators have not had an opportunity of comparing the provisions of the Bill with the original Act, I shall be glad if the Minister will report progress.

Progress reported.

Senate adjourned at 11.47 a.m.

House of Representatives.

Friday, 23 April, 1920.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson) took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES), *by leave*, agreed to—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Public Works Committee Act, the following members be appointed members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, viz.:—Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Bamford, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Parker Moloney.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES), *by leave*, proposed—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Committee of Public Accounts Act, the following members be appointed members of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts, viz.:—Mr. Bayley, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Prowse, and Mr. West.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [11.2].—I take no exception to the proposed *personnel* of the Accounts Committee, but I object to the giving of only two representatives to the Opposition, because of the unfairness of the arrangement, especially in view of

the fact that our numbers were increased by the last election—

Mr. HUGHES.—How many representatives had the Opposition before?

Mr. PAGE.—Three. It is not right to reduce our representation. No matter how they may protest, the members of the Farmers party constitute only the tail of the Ministerial party.

Mr. STEWART.—Is the honorable member in order in referring to members of the party to which I belong as the tail of another party?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I assume that the honorable member did not intend to use the term offensively, but if it is so regarded, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. PAGE.—I humbly apologize to the honorable members of the Farmers party; I was speaking metaphorically. If it will please them better, I shall call them the “head” of the Ministerial party. Had there been a decrease in the strength of the Opposition party, I would not have objected to the lessening of its representation on this Committee, but we have, on the contrary, increased our strength. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that after the 30th June next there will be only one Labour senator.

Mr. HUGHES.—What was the Opposition representation on the Committee on behalf of the Senate?

Mr. PAGE.—One member; but we cannot make a bus-horse of Senator Gardiner, by appointing him to every Committee merely to secure representation for the Opposition.

Mr. HUGHES.—Perhaps, then, it would be better to postpone the consideration of the motion, to see whether some understanding can be arrived at.

Mr. PAGE.—I would like that to be done.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the consideration of the motion be postponed until Wednesday next.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.8].—When the Works Committee and the Accounts Committee were first appointed, several years ago, the Opposition was given a representation of two on the Works Committee and of three on the Accounts Committee, and I told the “Whip” that it would not be fair on this occasion to give us only two members on the Finance

Committee. Even without the representatives of the Corner party, the Ministerialists will have a clear majority on the Committee, because they will have at least two Senate representatives.

Mr. HUGHES.—It must not be forgotten that we number thirty-eight, while you have only twenty-five members in your party.

Motion agreed to; debate adjourned.

VISIT OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

Mr. HUGHES.—On Wednesday next I propose to state the intentions of the Government regarding the adjournment of Parliament during the visit of the Prince of Wales, when I shall suggest that between then and the Prince's visit we shall sit on Tuesdays. I make the intimation now, so that honorable members who, during the week end, may be going to their homes in other States, may have an opportunity to make their arrangements accordingly.

Mr. TUDOR.—Your proposition will be that the House shall sit next Tuesday week.

Mr. HUGHES.—Yes.

TARIFF DISCUSSION.

Mr. HIGGS.—There are some persons in Queensland who wish to be in Melbourne when the Tariff is under discussion. Therefore, I ask the Prime Minister to look at the notice-paper before making a statement next Wednesday, so that he may then inform the House what business he expects to get through before the Tariff is discussed.

Mr. HUGHES.—I shall certainly do that. I have already informally consulted with the Leader of the Opposition on the subject, and I shall, as soon as possible, tell the House what we want to get done.

WAR PRECAUTIONS ACT.

Mr. GREGORY.—Is it the intention of the Government to continue in force the provisions of the War Precautions Act, which, according to the wording of the Act itself, are to operate until three months after the declaration of peace? Is it intended that the Act shall have force until three months after peace with Bulgaria and Turkey has been declared?

The general understanding was that it would cease to have effect three months after peace with Germany was declared.

Mr. HUGHES.—The Act itself fixes the time for its determination as the happening of a certain event, which cannot be brought about by honorable members, and certainly not by me. It must remain in force until that event has happened, or until legislation has been passed to amend it. Whether the Government will apply its provisions is a different question; and it will be for the honorable member to draw attention to any exercise of the powers conferred by it to which he may take exception.

ANZAC TWEED INDUSTRY.

Dr. MALONEY.—I have given notice of my intention to move the formal adjournment of the House this morning, but at the desire of the Government, and in recognition of the wish of honorable members generally that the Repatriation Bill shall be proceeded with, I shall postpone action until Wednesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the letter which the honorable member has addressed to me, giving notice of his intention to move the formal adjournment of the House, he speaks of his desire to discuss a definite matter "of urgent public importance." If action upon this matter can be postponed from day to day, some doubt may be thrown upon the urgency of it.

Dr. MALONEY.—I think that the consideration of the Repatriation Bill is the more urgent matter of the two.

ANZAC DAY.

Mr. PROWSE.—I do not know whether I shall be perfectly in order in what I am about to say, or whether I may not be anticipating the remarks of the Prime Minister, but I wish to draw attention to the fact that to-day there is being celebrated in Melbourne the landing of Australian troops on Gallipoli. I should like the Prime Minister to make some statement in recognition of that fact. As Parliament is sitting, members cannot join in the general celebrations taking place elsewhere.

Mr. HUGHES.—The anniversary of the day on which Australian troops landed on Gallipoli is commemorated by the Commonwealth by the making of it a

public holiday. In Victoria, however, it falls this year on the day appointed for the eight hours' celebration, and as it was thought that the clashing of the two festivals might not conduce to harmony, and would not give the public a proper opportunity to express their appreciation of the deeds of the Anzacs, it was arranged to celebrate the landing to-day instead of next Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has been privately suggested to me by the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) that we might pay our tribute of respect to the memory of the heroes who fell at Gallipoli by rising and remaining silent for the space of one minute. I had anticipated that the Leader of the House would perhaps have asked leave to move a motion. I will, however, ask honorable members to stand silent in their places for a few moments as a tribute to the memory of the gallant heroes who fell at Gallipoli, and as a mark of honour and respect to those who still survive that memorable landing.

Honorable members rose and remained standing accordingly.

Mr. RILEY.—In New South Wales Anzac Day is to be celebrated on Monday. The master retailers have decided to keep their premises open on that day, and to ignore the celebrations. Has this Parliament or Government any power to say that they shall not be permitted to do as they intend upon the holiday?

Mr. HUGHES.—I do not know whether we have. I shall look into the matter.

POST AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

ALLOWANCE POST OFFICES.

Mr. JOWETT (for Dr. EARLE PAGE) asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

How many keepers of allowance post offices have signified their intention of resigning, or have resigned, their positions since the 1st January, 1920?

Mr. WISE.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows:—

Two hundred and fifty-seven. The greater proportion of the resignations was due to the occupants of the positions leaving the district and to transfers of businesses in conjunction with which the post offices are conducted.

The total number of non-official offices in the Commonwealth is 7,233.

Mr. WISE.—On 15th April the honorable member for Eden-Monaro (Mr. Austin Chapman) asked—

1. Is it a fact that the Deputy Postmaster-General for New South Wales has intimated his intention of closing some of the post offices in country centres in that State, on the plea that those at present in charge are declining to continue the work at the low salaries offered?

2. Does he approve of this action?

I furnished an interim reply on that occasion, and am now able to supply the following detailed answers:—

1. Yes.

2. Payment for control of an allowance office is based on the volume of business transacted. In some cases demands are made for payment in excess of that justified, and in such event the persons interested are asked to assist the Department in obtaining the services of a suitable person at the justified rate of payment. During the past two years thirteen such requests were made by the Deputy Postmaster-General of New South Wales, but it was necessary only in one case to finally close the office.

NAVAL RADIO SERVICE.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Seeing that the members of the Naval Radio Service are not to receive the war gratuity, although they were engaged on important defence work in Australia during the war, is it the intention of the Government to grant them a war bonus, the same as received by other Commonwealth Government servants?

Mr. HUGHES.—The pay of the Naval Radio Service was fixed on 1st July, 1916, and was revised on 1st July, 1918, and again on 1st July, 1919, having regard to the increased cost of living. In these circumstances it is not the intention of the Government to grant a war bonus.

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, BROKEN HILL.

Mr. BLUNDELL asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Is it a fact that the Sub-Collector at Broken Hill was classified as a 3rd Class Sub-Collector in the year 1907?

2. Was the minimum salary for a sub-collector fixed by the classification at £380 per annum in the year 1907?

3. If so, was Alexander David Henry appointed or transferred to the office of Sub-Collector at Broken Hill in the year 1907, and paid by the Commonwealth the salary of £335 per annum, which was £45 below the minimum salary fixed for such office?

4. Is it a fact that for a period of six years and ten months Alexander David Henry was

not paid by the Commonwealth the minimum salary fixed for the office of a 3rd Class Sub-Collector?

Mr. GREENE.—The information is being obtained.

SENIOR CADET TRAINEES.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

Whether there is any travelling allowance made or are railway tickets provided for youths who have to attend compulsory drills?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—It is presumed that the above question refers to trainees of Senior Cadet age. Railway tickets are not issued, nor are any allowances made, except in the case of Senior Cadets proceeding to rifle ranges for the purpose of musketry, when rail tickets are issued. Attendance at ordinary parades does not, in the great majority of cases, involve any travelling.

EXPORT OF SUPERPHOSPHATES.

Mr. FENTON asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is true, as reported, that he has decided to allow the export of surplus superphosphates from Australia to New Zealand?

2. If so, have Australian users of this fertilizer been secured against any rise in prices?

3. What quantities has the Minister allowed to be exported?

Mr. GREENE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. The supplies of superphosphate are dependent upon the amount of phosphate rock imported. The Government have kept a very careful check upon supplies, and export of superphosphate has been prohibited until we are assured that Australian requirements are being fully provided for. The Government of New Zealand, for some months past, have been pressing us to permit the export of superphosphate to that country, as their stocks were completely exhausted, and they depend upon Australia for supplies. We are now permitting a limited quantity to go to New Zealand, but it is impossible to say what quantity will be exported, as it depends upon the consumption in Australia and the quantity of phosphate rock imported. Up to the present, permits have been granted for 900 tons.

2. Owing to the proposals of the Government to vest the necessary powers in this Parliament having been defeated at the recent referendum, the power to fix prices is in the hands of the States.

3. See answer to No. 1.

TAXATION.

REVENUE FROM ABSENTEES AND COMPANIES—TOTALISATOR DIVIDENDS.

Mr. WEST asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. What is the total amount of revenue received from absentees and from companies under land taxation?

2. What is the total amount of revenue received from absentees and companies registered outside Australia under income taxation?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. The total received from absentees for the years 1910-11 to 1918-19 inclusive is £515,701. Separate statistics are not compiled in respect of land tax paid by companies.

2. The total received from absentees for the years 1915-16 to 1918-19 inclusive is £1,172,961. The information is not available in respect of companies registered outside Australia.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. JACKSON) asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Whether his attention has been drawn to the notice in the press, on the 21st April, regarding the imposition of a tax of 13 per cent. on totalisator moneys available for dividends?

2. Does the Government regard totalisator investments as a lottery in the same manner as Tattersall's tickets?

3. Is the imposition constitutional?

4. If so, will the Government bring in a Bill to compel all racing clubs in Australia to install a totalisator service?

5. If not, does the Government intend to tax betting tickets in the same proportion, so that all persons investing money on races will be placed on the same footing?

6. Whether, in view of the alleged unfairness of the impost as proposed, the Government will delay the date of commencement of collection of the tax, so that honorable members may have an opportunity of discussing the matter?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. Yes.

2. The Commissioner of Taxation has decided that totalisator investments are a lottery within the meaning of section 7 of the Income Tax Act 1919.

3. Yes.

4. The Commonwealth has not the necessary power.

5 and 6. The Government will consider these matters.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE.

MEMORIALS TO FALLEN.

Mr. RYAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to use Australian marble in the erection overseas of memorials to Australian fallen soldiers?

2. Will the material used in the erection of such memorials be all Australian?

3. Will the workmen employed in the work of erection of such memorials be Australians?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The question of the erection of memorials to commemorate the deeds of the Australian Imperial Force is being considered by the Government, and it is hoped to make an announcement at an early date. The construction of the divisional memorials was, however, taken in hand whilst the troops were still in France, it being the desire of members of the Australian Imperial Force to take part in the actual work.

TANUNDA CLUB.

Mr. GABB asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether he intends to inform the House what are the reasons for the Government's refusal to allow the Tanunda Club to re-open?

2. If so, what are they?

Mr. HUGHES.—I would refer the honorable member to my reply to a similar question asked by him yesterday.

COAL SUPPLIES.

DISTRIBUTION IN VICTORIA.

Mr. CHANTER asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Does the Federal Government still control the receipt and distribution of coal supplies to the residents of Victoria?

2. If so, is it a fact that the distribution of coal is confined only to those controlling public utilities and manufacturing industries?

3. Is it a fact that retail fuel dealers are complaining that they cannot obtain coal supplies for the use of private householders?

4. Is it a fact that some dealers who have stocks of coal in hand state that the authorities will not allow them to supply it to householders?

5. If the rationing of coal is to continue, will the Prime Minister make arrangements by which private householders may obtain coal, seeing that supplies to them are claimed to be equally as necessary and meritorious as are those to manufacturing and other industries?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1, 2, 3, and 4. Yes.

5. The matter will receive the consideration of the Government.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT
EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FENTON (for Mr. ANSTEY) asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

Are the employees of the Produce Branch of the Agricultural Department in Victoria employed and paid by the Commonwealth Government, or are they partly employed and paid by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government of Victoria?

Mr. GREENE.—The employees of the Produce Branch of the Agricultural Department of Victoria are employed and paid by the State. The Commonwealth, however, reimburses the State a portion of these officers' salaries in respect of work performed in connexion with the administration of the Commerce and Quarantine Acts.

WAR SERVICE HOMES.

OPERATIONS OF COMMONWEALTH BANK.

Mr. POYNTON.—On the 31st March, the honorable member for Capricornia (Mr. Higgs) asked—

1. On what date did the Commonwealth Bank agree with the Minister for Repatriation to administer certain sections of the Commonwealth War Service Homes Act?

2. On what date did the Commonwealth Bank commence to build war service homes?

3. On what date did the Commonwealth Bank have the first war service home completed?

4. How many war service homes have been built to date under agreement with the Commonwealth Bank?

5. What is the average size and cost of war service homes built by the Commonwealth Bank?

I am now able to supply the following particulars:—

1. 27th June, 1919. The agreement is between the War Service Homes Commissioner, not the Minister, as stated, and the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank.

2. 20th July, 1919.

3. 27th August, 1919.

4. To 1st April, 1920, 296 homes had been constructed by the Commonwealth Bank.

5. Brick dwellings—Three rooms and kitchen, laundry, bath room, and offices. The

average floor space is 1,107 square feet. Cost of dwelling—£670 10s. Wooden dwellings—Three rooms and kitchen, laundry, bath room, and offices. The average floor space is 1,179 square feet. Cost of dwelling—£552.

CENTRAL WOOL COMMITTEE.

SALE OF CLIPS.

Mr. HUGHES.—On 3rd March, the honorable member for Echuca (Mr. Hill) asked the following questions:—

1. Whether the Prime Minister will lay on the table of the House copies of the agreements of sale of the 1917-18, 1918-19, and 1919-20 wool clips between the Central Wool Committee and the Imperial Government?
2. Will the Prime Minister also inform the House—

- (a) The nature and *personnel* of the representation of the Central Wool Committee in England with respect to re-sales of wool by the Imperial authorities?
- (b) The quantity of wool re-sold, the amount received from re-sales with respect to each clip, showing—(a) the Imperial Government's quota, and (b) the Central Wool Committee's quota on behalf of the Australian wool-growers?
- (c) What amount of money has the Central Wool Committee in hand from re-sales of wool and otherwise for disbursement amongst the Australian wool-growers; when is the next disbursement likely to be made; and, approximately, the total amount and the amount per cent. to the individual growers?

I am now able to furnish the following information:—

1. In reply to a question by the honorable member for Wannon (Mr. Rodgers) yesterday, I laid on the table copy of cablegrams constituting the contract between the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments in regard to the purchase of the Australian wool clips 1916-17, 1917-18, 1918-19, and 1919-20.

2. I now lay on the table the remainder of the information desired by the honorable member for Echuca.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

Customs Act—Regulations Amended—Statutory Rules 1920, Nos. 50, 55.

Wool Clips—Letter of Sir J. M. Higgins, Chairman of the Central Wool Committee, dated 10th March, 1920, respecting the cablegrams, &c., constituting the contract between the Imperial and the Commonwealth Governments regarding the purchase of Australian Wool Clips, and other matters connected therewith.

AUSTRALIAN SOLDIERS' REPATRIATION BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed from 22nd April, *vide* page 1478):

Clause 24—Amendment withdrawn and clause agreed to.

Clause 25 agreed to.

Clause 26—

1. Each Board shall be charged with the duties of—

- (a) determining whether the death or incapacity of a member of the Forces in fact resulted from an occurrence happening during the period he was a member of the Forces, and in the case of incapacity the nature and extent thereof;
- (b) determining whether the death or incapacity of a person enlisted or appointed for active service in connexion with naval or military preparation or operations in fact resulted from his employment in connexion with those preparations or operations;

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [11.29].—I desire to raise a question with respect to the phrase, "in fact resulted from an occurrence happening during the period he was a member of the Forces." I would like to see some more accurate description of the ground upon which soldiers may be entitled to pensions and benefits. Every honorable member must have received scores of refusals from the Department to deal with cases of merit merely because the injury to the party concerned was stated not to have resulted from warlike operations. With respect to this Bill, while the phraseology is a little different from that in the original Act, it appears that the interpretations of the officials will be much the same. There are many men who were accepted for service abroad, and who were apparently in fit condition. Under the strain of war service, however, disabilities developed, and, upon their return to Australia, they were unable to earn a living, or to earn as good a living as before their departure for the Front. In stating their case for relief, they are now met by the medical report that the injury or complaint which has developed is not due to warlike operations. The wording of the clause before us seems to make it much more difficult for them to obtain relief.

Mr. GROOM.—The provision in the clause is much wider than the wording of the Act.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The clause provides that a member of the Forces must put his finger on an occurrence which happened during the period of his service in the Australian Imperial Force as something which has resulted in his present incapacity. But how can a man whose affection or disease has actually developed during his period of service with the Australian Imperial Force put his finger on any occurrence during that period of service as being such as to lead to the gradual growth of his infirmity? The way ought to be made easy for relief to be obtained by any member of the Australian Imperial Force who has come back incapacitated because of the conditions under which he has laboured during his period of service.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [11.32].—The existing Act provides for relief being given where the incapacity or death of a member of the Australian Imperial Force has resulted from his employment in connexion with warlike operations; but on occasions death or incapacity has been brought about, not as the result of anything in connexion with warlike operations, but as the result of happenings during the term of his period of employment. The wording of the clause is expressly intended to cover occurrences not necessarily in connexion with warlike operations. It really extends the provision in the Act. It will enable a pension to be granted in cases which the Act does not cover. Assistance is to be given where the death or incapacity of a member of the Australian Imperial Force has resulted from an occurrence happening during the period when he was a member of the Forces.

Mr. GREGORY (Dampier) [11.34].—It is purely a matter of administration, but while we are discussing a provision of this nature it is well to let those who are likely to administer it gain some idea as to what Parliament desires. I had before any notice some time ago the case of a miner who, before enlisting, was quite capable of following his employment, but after spending a couple of years in the trenches in France, he returned to Australia absolutely crippled with rheu-

matism. The Pensions Department declined to give him any pension, on the ground that he had suffered from rheumatism before enlisting. That was an administrative act, and I do not see how we can make the Statute clearer, because the determining factor in every case must be the Board; but in this instance I had to do that to which I always take particular objection—I had to bring the matter under the attention of the Pensions Department, and point out that surely this man's incapacity must have resulted from his employment in connexion with warlike operations. Owing to my representations, he received a small pension. However, that is not the way in which the Act should be administered.

Mr. WATKINS.—Once a medical officer has passed a man into the Forces, and certified that he is fit to go to the Front, should not the military authorities assume every responsibility for him?

Mr. GREGORY.—But we must leave a certain amount of discretion to the Board. I do not see how the wording of the clause can be altered with advantage, because we may throw upon the Board the onus of granting pensions to undeserving persons. However, it should be aware of the fact that Parliament desires this provision to be dealt with, not harshly, but humanely and sensibly.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.36].—I prefer the clause in the Bill to the provision in the Act, because it gives the Board greater discretion. Members of the Forces have lost their lives or become incapacitated, not actually as the result of warlike operations, but through accident. One man who was invalided home formed one of a party which left one of our base hospitals for a trip to Ringwood, but, owing to his incapacity, he wandered away from the others, and, as a result, met with his death. His widow was not able to obtain any relief from the Repatriation Board. Soldiers should not be put in the position of having to secure the services of members of Parliament to voice their claims for pensions. I know that quite a number of them are quite able to push their own claims, but others are more diffident, and we ought not to allow them to suffer on that account. I shall always vote for any amendment of this provision that will place all men in the position of being able to get fair treatment.

Mr. HILL (Echuca) [11.38].—Quite recently a returned soldier repatriated on the land committed suicide. It can be proved that he was suffering at the time from the effects of his experience at the Front, but there is no provision in our legislation for giving assistance to his widow and family. Will the clause provide that relief?

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [11.39].—Apparently it is one of those cases in which the Board may exercise its discretion. The honorable member refers to the case of a man who has received such injury resulting from an occurrence happening during the war as to destroy the balance of his judgment, and after his discharge from the Forces has committed suicide. I would not like to say that such a case is definitely excluded from the provisions of the existing Act. Once a member of the Australian Imperial Force has been discharged, he carries only the rights of an ordinary civilian; but the general intention is to grant relief in regard to occurrences happening during the period of the war. I shall submit the point raised by the honorable member for the consideration of the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen).

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [11.41].—I move—

That in sub-clause 1, paragraph a, the words, "in fact resulted from an occurrence happening during the period he was", be left out, with a view to insert in lieu the words "resulted from his employment as".

If this amendment is agreed to, each Board will be charged with the duties of determining whether the death or incapacity of a member of the Forces resulted from his employment as a member of the Forces. I think the Government should assume responsibility for any injury which is suffered by a soldier through having enlisted, and that the competent Board which has power to investigate all cases should be able to deal with them on their merits. The clause as it stands does not cover the numerous cases of men who have been turned adrift unable to earn a livelihood, and whose applications for assistance are refused because the medical officers have determined that before enlistment they were suffering from the various diseases and affections which now incapacitate them. Thus these men are

placed in a position entirely different from that which they would have occupied had they not gone to the Front, because it is undoubted that their diseases or affections have been aggravated by their service in the Australian Imperial Force. Every honorable member has met dozens of such cases which are not due to any specific happening during the period of employment in the Australian Imperial Force, but have been aggravated owing to the worry and strain of their service, or to shell shock occurring during their employment in the Forces. At present we are helpless to deal with such cases. I have not heard any one attempt to set up a claim that we should not regard the aggravation of complaints which results in reduced efficiency as being on the same basis as accidents that occur during the time of a soldier's service at the Front. Yet these cases are not covered either by the provision in the Act or by the wording of the clause now before us. We ought to clothe the Board with the fullest power to deal equitably with every case on its merits; but with the limitations imposed by the provision in the Act or by the clause before us, they will not be in a position to do so. My amendment would leave it open for relief to be granted in regard to everything that happened to a soldier during the course of his employment in the Forces. A man may have gone away apparently well, having had no difficulty in passing the medical examination, but because of the conditions under which he served, he may have returned inefficient and unable to do the work he did previously. My amendment would enable relief to be given to such a man. It cannot be given to him under the clause as it stands.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [11.45].—In regard to the case mentioned by the honorable member for Echuca (**Mr. Hill**), I find on inquiry that the principle on which the Act is now administered is that if, as a matter of fact, the death of a soldier can be connected with injuries sustained while he was a member of the Forces a pension is granted to his dependants. I am not pronouncing judgment upon the honorable member's case; I simply point out that it is merely a question of the application of the principle to the facts. Coming to the case

stated by the honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory), I learn that if the Medical Board certifies that a complaint from which an applicant for a pension was suffering has been aggravated by reason of his service a pension is granted.

Mr. RILEY.—Many have been turned down because of the finding of the medical men. This gives no relief.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—They are not all turned down on that plea.

Mr. GROOM.—I can only suggest that cases of the kind to which reference has been made should be re-submitted.

Mr. RODGERS.—In the earlier days of the Department the Act was not so sympathetically administered. I know of many cases where men have exhausted the whole of their resources in trying to cure themselves.

Mr. GROOM.—I plead guilty to having re-submitted cases where pensions in the first case have been refused.

I ask the honorable member for Illawarra (Mr. Lamond) not to press his amendment, since it would really have the effect of restricting what we now propose to do. Under the wording of his proposed amendment it would be necessary for an applicant for a pension to prove that his incapacity was the result of his employment in the service; that is to say, he would have to prove that he was employed to do a certain act, and that in the performance of that duty he suffered a casualty. The wording of paragraph *a* of clause 26 is much wider, and is intended to meet cases of the kind that have been brought under notice. There was a case in Queensland where a man, while on leave, met with an accident which incapacitated him. Such a case would come within the meaning of this clause, since the casualty would be "an occurrence happening during the period in which he was a member of the Forces." We are going a long way towards meeting many of the cases to which reference has been made. There must be some one to determine the facts, and the Board will simply have to decide whether death or incapacity in fact resulted from an occurrence which happened during the period of the man's employment in the Forces. The clause does not speak of incapacity sustained while acting in pursuance of a military order, but is much wider, since it covers occurrences hap-

pening to a man while a member of the Forces.

Mr. BRUCE (Flinders) [11.49].—The wording of paragraph *a* of clause 26 is very wide, but it will be useless unless it is liberally interpreted. I do not think any words we could insert would cover all the cases that might arise; but if, as I understand, from the Minister for Works and Railways (Mr. Groom), the attitude of the Department now is to construe the words "an occurrence happening during the period in which he was a member of the Forces" in such a way that a man who went away with some slight disease which was aggravated by his war service would be eligible—

Mr. POYNTON.—How are we going to prove that he had a slight disease when he went away? Let every man who went away put in his claim without restriction.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The Department is continually asserting that it knows of these cases.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is a very dangerous principle.

Mr. BRUCE.—If the Minister in charge of the Bill is going to take up the very attitude which I suggested the Department would take up, it is perfectly obvious that we must amend the clause. If he would hear what we have to say instead of taking up a hostile attitude before he is able to appreciate the point we wish to make, it might be possible to allow the clause to go. I know of cases where men were rheumatic subjects when they enlisted, and would probably have suffered no serious inconvenience from the disease, but that they went on service. In some cases these men have come back practically hopeless cripples. They are crippled with rheumatism as a result of war service. I understand from the Minister for Works and Railways (Mr. Groom) that the Department now takes up the attitude that the aggravation of the disease in such a case would be an occurrence happening while a man was a member of the Forces, and would deal sympathetically with it.

Mr. GROOM.—Provided that the Medical Board certified that it was.

Mr. BRUCE.—Assuming, of course, that the Medical Board certified that it had been aggravated because of his service. If that is a correct

interpretation of the attitude of the Department I shall be prepared to accept the clause as it stands; but if, on the other hand, the Minister in charge of the Bill (Mr. Poynton) has correctly indicated the attitude of the Department I am not prepared to agree to it.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [11.53].

—I was pleased to hear the explanation given by the Minister for Works and Railways (Mr. Groom), but am not satisfied that the clause, as it stands, will meet cases such as those mentioned by the honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory). The fact that the men were pronounced sound and fit when they were accepted for service should be sufficient. When a man comes back crippled with rheumatism, and asks for a pension, he should not be told, "You had a taint of rheumatism before you enlisted."

Mr. GROOM.—There might be cases of wilful concealment.

Mr. RILEY.—That is so, but we do not want to be niggardly in this matter. If a man, after serving overseas, comes back crippled with rheumatism, the fact that he was accepted for service as sound and fit should be a guarantee that he contracted the disease while on active service. I hope that the honorable member for Dampier will press for a more definite statement from the Minister.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.55].

—The medical men examined volunteers for active service under very troublesome and difficult circumstances. The Defence Department foolishly rejected an offer made by Dr. O'Hara to place at the disposal of the medical officers examining volunteers in Melbourne his consulting rooms, where they could have been examined under the best conditions. As it was, the men were examined at the Town Hall, and the noise caused by passing trams made it very hard to listen to heart and lung sounds. Two men from the Hospital for Incurables here actually volunteered, and were passed for active service, and in face of that fact the Government are wise in trying to secure that justice shall be done, while at the same time protecting themselves from unreasonable claims. It was very unwise for the Government to make a grant of £4,500 to the dependants of a certain officer, since it raises in the minds of the public a suspicion that those in high positions, with influence to aid them, can

obtain what those in more lowly positions are unable to secure.

Mr. LAZZARINI (Werriwa) [11.57].—

I shall not be satisfied unless this clause is sufficiently wide to include every man who volunteered, and who contracted a disease while on active service, or developed it as a result of his service. Whether a man had the germ of a disease or not when he enlisted, if that disease developed while he was a member of the Forces, his case should come within this clause. I am prepared to admit, with the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney), that it is quite possible that, owing to the difficult circumstances in which the examinations were made, in some instances men were passed who ought not to have been accepted for service. In dealing with thousands of cases, the doctors, no matter how efficient they might have been, were bound, on the law of average, to pass some who should have been rejected. Long before he enlisted, a man might have had in his constitution the germ of a disease, or might have had some slight complaint which did not interfere with his industrial efficiency. Under active service conditions that disease might have been aggravated. The wonder to me is that every Australian soldier who spent any time in Europe did not come back troubled with rheumatism. Is the Board administering the Department to callously shelter itself behind the paltry excuse that a man is disentitled to a pension because, although crippled with rheumatism on his return from the war, he had the germ of the disease in his constitution when he volunteered? That would be a barbarous attitude to take up.

Mr. FENTON.—The answer to such a plea would be that, even if the man had the germ of the disease when he volunteered, he was accepted and used.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—Yes; I have no doubt that many of these men rendered just as effective service as those who have come back sound. The Act will be regarded as a barbarous instrument if it allows men to be treated in the way described simply because some one can say that before they enlisted they had the germ of the disease which developed during their period of service, and led to their incapacity.

Mr. MAHON (Kalgoorlie) [12.0].—

The Government should consider whether this clause can be satisfactorily administered. It throws upon each Board the

onus of inquiring, not merely into a man's war service at the Front, but clearly also into his condition of health before he went to the Front. That opens a very wide field for investigation; and, as there will be six separate Boards making investigations, and probably coming to decisions not in consonance with one another, we may expect a crop of injustices to result. There is an immense difficulty once you begin to make limitations as to who shall benefit and who shall be excluded from benefits, and it would almost pay this country to throw the door wide open and allow everybody who can prove incapacity within a certain period of the close of the war to share the benefits of this legislation. Otherwise we shall have some men receiving benefits under the law who, perhaps, are not as much entitled to them as are men who have been excluded. It is not as if there was to be one body dealing with all the cases. There will be six Boards or Commissions, and the common experience of those accustomed to juries is that a verdict given by one set of men would be scouted by another set. Different bodies of men look at things from different angles, and draw different conclusions from the same facts. The Government would, therefore, be wise to withdraw the clause for further consideration, because as it stands it will undoubtedly lead to an immense amount of trouble and, which is worse, work out unjustly.

Mr. POYNTON.—The Bill has to go through to-day.

Mr. MAHON.—Not necessarily! The sun will not stop in the heavens if it is not passed to-day.

Mr. POYNTON.—The desire is that the pensioners may get their money quickly.

Mr. PAGE.—Make it retrospective.

Mr. MAHON.—That is the idea; and then no hardship will ensue.

Mr. POYNTON.—You surely do not suggest that everybody who went to the war should be a participant?

Mr. MAHON.—I recognise the difficulty the Minister had in drafting a clause that would operate quite justly; but it should be possible to frame a clause which, while not opening the door to everybody, would, at any rate, make for

a greater amount of justice than this clause is likely to do in its present condition.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [12.5].—I hope the Government will accede to the honorable member's request. The men who volunteered for the Front had to submit to medical examination. They were passed by medical men as fit for active service. In some cases, they were on active service for four years or more. They come back, and ask for certain benefits under Acts that we have passed; and then it is discovered, under medical examination, that they have some constitutional defect which, the doctors say, originated prior to their enlistment. Because of that, they or their dependants are not to be entitled to the benefits of this measure. That is a most cruel way to deal with men who have served just as faithfully and well as have any others. In the medical and other professions, differences of opinion arise, and it is not easy to assign an actual date to the beginning of a disease in the human body. Medical testimony will be found equally divided in many cases as to whether the trouble originated in the pre-war period or during the war. If there is any doubt, the benefit of it should be given to the returned soldier and his dependants.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by **Mr. ROYNTON**) agreed to—

That the word "active", in paragraph b, be left out.

Mr. GREGORY (Dampier) [12.8].—Paragraph c charges the Board with the duty of "determining the extent to which persons alleged to be dependent upon a member of the Forces were in fact so dependent." Under the principal Act, the pension was assessed upon the average earnings of the soldier during the twelve months prior to his going to the Front. Many boys of eighteen enlisted, whose earnings prior to enlistment were probably nil. Applications were made by the mothers of those boys who were killed at the Front. The applicants were told that, as in many instances the boys had earned nothing during the year prior to enlistment, only the minimum pension of 7s. per week could be granted. When those boys went to the Front, they did

men's work. I know an instance of a boy who enlisted on his eighteenth birthday, was four years at the Front, and was killed. When his mother applied for a pension, she was asked what his average earnings were in the year before he went away. As he had been at school, she had to tell them that his earnings were nil. I have not been able to read this Bill carefully, and do not know whether a similar provision is contained in it. I cannot find anything of that nature in it, but we must make it absolutely clear that the same pension must be paid in the case of every boy who went into the firing-line as is paid in the case of a man. The provision to which I refer was one of the greatest anomalies in the old Act, and I sincerely hope it will not be perpetuated in this Bill.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey—Minister for Home and Territories) [12.10].—The position is that the widowed mother in the case the honorable member for Dampier speaks of gets the full pension where the boy has been killed.

Mr. GREGORY.—She did not do so.

Mr. POYNTON.—She gets now the full pension, whether she was dependent or not.

Mr. RILEY.—I can give the Minister a case where the mother cannot get it.

Mr. POYNTON.—I assure the honorable member that that is the case now, under a provision passed some time ago. I think that the payment of the full pension depends on whether she is in certain necessitous circumstances.

Mr. RILEY.—The case I have in my mind is one in which the boy, before he went away, was not living at home, and the mother was getting nothing from him.

Mr. POYNTON.—If he was killed, then she gets the pension.

Mr. RILEY.—She has not got it so far.

Mr. POYNTON.—Then I do not know why. She should get it under the Act as it stands to-day.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 27 and 28 agreed to.

Clause 29 (Failure of pensioner to attend at review of assessment or determination).

Mr. JAMES PAGE (Maranoa) [12.12].—The clause provides that where any assessment or determination in relation to the pension payable to a member of

the Forces is required to be reviewed, the Commission may cancel the pension if the member refuses or fails to attend at the time and place fixed, or by his default makes it impossible to review the pension. Many of these men in the outback portions of Australia will be very hard to get at. One case was brought under my notice when I was away up the other side of Thargomindah. A letter was sent to a pensioner, care of the post office at Cunnamulla, where he used to draw his pension. He had left Cunnamulla and gone further out west, and consequently did not get the letter. Afterwards, when he came into the town he found that his pension had been stopped, because he had not turned up for the review. It appeared that the officer in charge of the Pensions Department had ordered him in the letter to go to the nearest Board for review. He came in from 170 to 200 miles for that pension, and when he got there he found himself absolutely stranded, and I had to get him Government rations.

Mr. POYNTON.—There must be some penalty for a man who deliberately refuses to attend.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—The most damnable indictment against the whole of this Bill is that honorable members are legislating for the towns, and not for the country.

Mr. POYNTON.—Surely in a case like that, where the man's explanation was satisfactory, the pension would be restored, and he would receive back pay.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—The gentlemen sitting in their offices in the metropolitan centres do not know the conditions.

Mr. FLEMING.—The boys will soon appeal if they do not get fair play.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—By the time the appeal reached the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming) from the places I am thinking of, the man might be dead and buried. The honorable member surely has sense enough to know that there are no railways, telephones, or telegraph facilities in the outback portions of Queensland. I do not wish men to escape review, but I want them protected in case they are unable to attend.

Mr. POYNTON.—Do you think that Senator Millen, with his knowledge of Australian conditions, would treat a man in such a position harshly?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—No; and when I brought the case under Mr. Gilbert's notice, he ordered the man to be paid at once, until he could attend for review. But if I had not met the man when he found that his pension had been stopped, there is no telling what he might have done. Honorable members know that in many cases a bushman would use the good old Australian adjective, and say, "Well, you can keep it."

Mr. GROOM.—The Department will always restore back pay, but the difficulty is that the man does not turn up.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—But you make it imperative on him to turn up.

Mr. GROOM.—It must be imperative. It is only fair to him. The pension would not be cancelled without giving him an opportunity of being heard. If he does not take advantage of that opportunity, the Department takes action, but if later on he comes in and shows that he had good reason for not attending, the matter is re-opened.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Has the Board or the Commission power to re-open or review the case?

Mr. GROOM.—The power exists.

Mr. FLEMING (Robertson) [12.15].—I do not believe that any hardship will arise under this clause, but it is well that the question has been raised, so that the Commission and Boards may know that honorable members are concerned to insure that no disabilities are suffered by men who are in the outlying portions of the Commonwealth. Many of the boys will be scattered in distant parts, and I hope that those who are charged with the administration of the Act will realize their responsibility to them.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 30 and 31 agreed to.

Clause 32 verbally amended and agreed to.

Clauses 33 to 35 agreed to.

Clause 36 (Pension to *de facto* wife of a member).

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.20].—I should like an assurance from the Minister as to how far this clause affects the rights of a wife when her husband has left her, and is living with another woman.

Mr. POYNTON.—The rights of the legal wife are not affected.

Mr. GROOM.—This clause merely re-enacts section 10a of the existing Act.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 37 verbally amended and agreed to.

Clauses 38 to 44 agreed to.

Clause 45—

The provisions of this Act shall extend to the case of any soldier of the Imperial Reserve Forces called up for active service.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.24].—I take no exception to the extension of the benefits of the Act to British reservists. The Government of which I was a member decided that British reservists who had made Australia their home, and were called up for service with the Imperial Army, should be placed on the same footing as members of the Australian Imperial Force. I wish to make an appeal, however, on behalf of another class of men—Australians who were abroad at the outbreak of war, and enlisted in England, Canada, and elsewhere in order to avoid the delay of returning to Australia for the purpose.

Mr. BURCHELL.—Those who enlisted in England will receive the Imperial pension.

Mr. TUDOR.—But I do not think that the Imperial repatriation benefits are as liberal as our own.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I agree with the honorable member.

Mr. BRUCE.—This clause deals only with pensions.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Imperial pensions may not be as good as those paid by the Commonwealth. There were also many men who could not pass the severe medical test that was prescribed in the early days of the war, and who either worked their passage or travelled steerage to England in order to enlist there.

Mr. GROOM.—I am informed that the Imperial Act is almost as liberal as our own.

Mr. TUDOR.—If there is any doubt about it we ought to make sure that those men are not penalized. I am not appealing for the men who were not able to work themselves up for a commission in Australia, but had sufficient money to go to England and buy one there, but for those other men who enlisted in England either because they were there when the war broke out or because they were rejected in Australia on medical grounds.

Mr. LISTER.—Some of them were denied permission to enlist in the Australian Imperial Force in England or to transfer from the British Forces to the Australian Army.

Mr. GROOM.—We do give all those men repatriation assistance.

Mr. TUDOR.—What I am asking is that if the British pension is £1, and the Australian 25s., the men who enlisted in England should receive from the Commonwealth the difference.

Mr. POYNTON.—So far as pay is concerned we do make up the difference. If the honorable member will allow the matter to remain in abeyance for the time being I shall make inquiries into it.

Mr. BLAKELEY (Darling) [12.30].—The point raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) is very important to many men in Australia. I do not know the number of men who are affected, but five cases have been brought under my notice. One was that of a man who was resident in the Argentine Republic when the war broke out, and who paid his passage to England in order to enlist. He was not allowed to join the Australian Imperial Force. Of course, his pay, his pension, and all his privileges were considerably less than they would have been had he joined that Force. In another case which came under my notice only last week, a soldier who was rejected in Australia paid his passage to England, where he enlisted in the Imperial Forces, with which he served for a period of about three years. He was then given a free return passage to Australia. I recently made application on his behalf—

Mr. GROOM.—For what did the honorable member apply—a pension or repatriation?

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I broadly applied for any privileges which may be granted to Australians who, after being rejected here, went to England, and there enlisted in the British Forces. Nobody can discriminate between the individual who, having been rejected in Australia, paid his own passage to England, and the volunteer who enlisted in Australia.

Mr. FOWLER.—If any discrimination is to be made, it should certainly be in favour of the man who went to so much trouble to enlist.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I think that the Minister will admit the correctness of the honorable member's interjection.

Mr. FOWLER.—The man also lost a large amount in pay owing to the difference between the rate paid to members of the Australian Imperial Force and the Imperial rate of 1s. 2d. per day.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am quite sure that that difference in pay has been made up.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Not in this particular case.

Mr. POYNTON.—Has the honorable member received a reply to say that the man is not entitled to that difference between the two rates of pay?

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I have not. But that is not sufficient. The admission by the Minister that this man has some claim to the difference between his Imperial rate of pay and the rate paid to the Australian Imperial Force puts him on an equality with the members of the Australian Imperial Force. If he is entitled to be placed on an equality with the Australian Imperial Force in regard to pay, he is certainly entitled to be similarly placed in regard to pensions. I have here an amendment, which I drafted some time ago, but I would prefer that the Minister himself should move it. I would like to insert after the word "service", the words "and any soldier who enlisted in the British Forces."

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member must make his amendment much wider than that. He must employ almost the same phrasing as is employed in paragraph c of clause 46, which reads:—"is serving or has served during the present war in the Naval or Military Forces of any part of the King's Dominions other than the Commonwealth."

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I am sure that the Minister recognises the justice of the claim which I am urging. The Government, in their policy, have done so, and I ask the Minister to incorporate in this clause the words employed in paragraph c of clause 46, to which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) has directed attention.

Mr. GROOM.—The Minister has promised to look into the matter.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—With all due respect, it is scarcely fair treatment for the Minister to promise merely to look into it.

We require to know his decision. Seeing that he will not move in the direction suggested, I am obliged to take action myself. I therefore move—

That after the word "service", line 3, the words "any Australian who is serving or has served during the present war in the Naval or Military Forces of any part of the King's Dominions" be inserted.

The adoption of my amendment will make it quite clear that no person who is not a *bonâ fide* resident of Australia will be qualified to receive the pension.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey—Minister for Home and Territories) [12.38].—If I understand it aright the amendment means either one of two things. If we adopt it we shall have to assume the obligation of providing pensions for these men, and in so far as we do that we shall relieve the Imperial Government of their responsibility to pay pensions which they are entitled to pay to those who enlisted in their service. On the other hand, it is just possible that these men may obtain a pension from the Imperial Government and also a pension from the Commonwealth. There is only one legitimate claim which can be made on their behalf, namely, that we shall make up the difference between the Imperial rate of pension and our own rate.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—That is all right.

Mr. POYNTON.—But the amendment will not achieve that result.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Cannot the Minister get an amendment drafted that will?

Mr. POYNTON.—There are legal men in this Committee, and they have not drafted such an amendment. I ask honorable members to allow the clause to remain as it stands. I well remember the late Charles Cameron Kingston's advice to a Minister—"Stick to your Bill. When you get away from its provisions you cannot tell where you are going to be landed."

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [12.40].—I have no doubt that the Minister is at heart kindly disposed towards these men, but we have had many promises by Ministers equally sympathetic—promises to which no effect has been given. Let me add to the cases of hardship which have already been cited. I know of a young Australian who was in China when the war broke out. He was very anxious to serve his country, and, being offered an opportunity of securing a passage to Eng-

land, he accepted it, and went to the Old Country. Upon his arrival there he immediately approached those in charge of our Australian troops, with a view to enlisting, but they refused to accept him. He then enlisted in the Imperial Army, with which he served for three years, afterwards returning to Australia, his passage being paid by the Imperial Government. In such cases surely a reciprocal arrangement can be made between the oversea Dominions and the Old Country.

Mr. FLEMING.—Does the man draw a pension?

Mr. FENTON.—Not so far as I know. He is an Australian, who wishes to be placed, if possible, upon an equality with the members of the Australian Imperial Force. I do not know what precluded an Australian officer in Britain from accepting a man coming from China or from some other part of the world. The honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) stated that one of the men whose case he mentioned came from the Argentine.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—But the adoption of the amendment would give rise to possible complications.

Mr. FENTON.—The cases of this kind are so few that I feel sure some reciprocal arrangement could be made.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Suppose that a man had been absent from Australia for ten or fifteen years before enlisting in the Imperial Forces?

Mr. FENTON.—That would be an extreme case. I do not desire to see any man drawing two pensions or enjoying two sets of privileges. But the amendment would apply to so few cases that the Committee may very well adopt it.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.44].—I would suggest to the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) that it would be wise for him to phrase his amendment in such a way as to preclude the possibility of any man drawing two pensions.

Mr. GROOM.—Paragraph c of clause 23 will prevent that.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think honorable members generally are of opinion that an Australian who went to considerable trouble to enlist should, at any rate, not be placed in a worse position than other Australians. We should so provide that if an Imperial or Dominion pension is less than our own it may be raised to an equal amount,

though I recognise that it is difficult, on the spur of the moment, to frame an amendment with that effect.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am prepared to postpone the further consideration of the clause until later in the day.

Clause postponed.

Clause 46 verbally amended and agreed to.

Clause 47—

The Commission may make recommendations to the Governor-General for regulations providing for the granting of assistance and benefits, not being in the nature of pensions as provided for in Part III. of this Act—

(iii) the mothers of deceased or incapacitated Australian soldiers—

(a) who are widows and were, prior to the enlistment of those soldiers, dependent upon them, or

(iv) the incapacitated fathers of deceased or incapacitated Australian soldiers who were, prior to the enlistment of those soldiers, dependent upon them, and

(v) the mothers or step-mothers (being either widowed, divorced, deserted, or unmarried) of Australian soldiers who were born out of wedlock;

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) agreed to—

That the words, line 4, "in the nature of" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words, "payments or allowances in the nature of, or supplementary to,"

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) proposed—

That in sub-paragraph (iii), after the word "mothers" the words, "or step-mothers" be inserted.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [12.49].—I have had brought to my attention some sad cases for which, unfortunately, no provision is made. A mother lost her only son through illness while he was on active service. When the boy enlisted his father was alive, but he died shortly after his boy's death, largely, I think, as the result of the loss of this, his only son. The mother of the dead soldier was now left absolutely penniless, and, under the existing Act and regulations, she is entitled to no assistance in the way of pension, simply because her husband was alive at the time of the boy's death.

Mr. GROOM.—I think that is altered now.

Mr. FOWLER.—So far as I know, a case of this kind is not met by this Bill.

Mr. GROOM.—If at any time a mother is without adequate means of support after the death of a son, assistance is granted.

Mr. POYNTON.—If the mother applies for a pension, she will be given one straightway.

Mr. FOWLER.—I am glad to know that; because, up to the present, a pension has been refused.

Mr. CORSER (Wide Bay) [12.50].—I should like to know from the Minister (Mr. Poynton) whether some cases I have in my mind are such as may be dealt with by the Commission. In one case, two young fellows before going to the Front had had some experience in engineering, and when they returned after some years' fighting they started a motor engineer's business in partnership. They are careful, steady men; but when they applied for assistance, the answer they received was to the effect that it was not within the scope of the regulations, on the ground that, prior to enlisting, they had not owned and conducted a similar business. It is true that, before enlisting, they were not in business for themselves, but were learning as paid employees. Why should young soldiers who are enterprising enough to start business, but who have not sufficient money to provide all the necessary tools, be debarred from advantages enjoyed by other members of the Forces? In another case, two young fellows, before enlisting, had been engaged on a newspaper for years, and the owner of the paper has stated that if they had not gone to the war they would have been made partners. Since their return to Australia, these young men have been offered, by a sleeping partner, an interest in this newspaper. The matter was brought before a member of the Cabinet, who told me that the men would be able to get assistance; and on that assurance they purchased the interest offered. For any advances made, they are prepared to give the full security of this interest, and also their gratuities; but they are informed that, under the existing Act and regulations, assistance cannot be given them. I should like to know whether, if

this Bill passes, there will be vested in the Commission power to give assistance in cases of this kind; if not, it is my intention to move an amendment.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey—Minister for Home and Territories) [12.54].—There is no doubt in my mind that the Commission will be vested with the power indicated by the honorable member. The regulations made by the present Commission will lapse with the appointment of the new Commission, and the latter will be empowered to consider all such cases, and make recommendations. I wish to make it clear, however, that the recommendations of the Commission will be subject to Ministerial approval—a necessary provision for the protection of the finances.

Mr. CORSER.—This Bill grants larger powers than are exercised under the present Act?

Mr. POYNTON.—Yes. I cannot see any reason why such cases as have been mentioned should not be assisted by the Commission. It would be very unwise, however, to stipulate in the Bill what particular classes of business shall be assisted. Quite a large amount of money will be involved in the administration of this Bill, and it is only proper that the Commission should consider each case. There is no need, of course, why the new Commission should follow in the footsteps of the previous Commission—

Mr. LISTER.—It may do so.

Mr. POYNTON.—Of course, it may; but we cannot in the Bill specify the Commission's powers in regard to particular businesses. The honorable member for Wide Bay (Mr. Corser) may rest assured that the Commission will have the power he desires.

Mr. FLEMING (Robertson) [12.55].—I hope that the Commission and the Boards will interpret the Bill in the generous spirit suggested by the Minister (Mr. Poynton). There is no doubt that under the present Act there are cases of very grievous harshness. Men desire to be established in the businesses which they would have been following if they had not gone to the war, but under the present Act are unable to get the assistance necessary to enable them to do so. Many men who previously worked for their fathers or others in a variety of businesses would by this time have been partners

had they not enlisted; but simply because they were not actually established in the businesses before they enlisted they are refused the benefits of the Act. I am glad to hear that the Commission and the Boards will be enabled to take a wider view in the administration of the Act, the whole spirit of which is more generous than that of the old Act. According to this clause, the Commission is given power to make recommendations for the granting of assistance to—

the incapacitated fathers of deceased or incapacitated Australian soldiers who were, prior to the enlistment of the soldier, dependent upon them.

It seems to me that unless this provision is very widely administered it will fall far short of what is desired. I am prepared to admit that to strike out the words "who were prior to the enlistment of those soldiers dependent upon them" might lead to some cases of imposition, but I draw attention to the limitation imposed by the words. There are cases such as that mentioned by the honorable member for Perth (Mr. Fowler) a few moments ago, and his remarks apply not only to mothers, but to fathers. I think that an incapacitated father, although he may not have been dependent on the soldier before enlistment, ought in certain circumstances to come within the scheme, and the Government ought to make certain that such cases will be met.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments (by Mr. Poynton) agreed to—

That the words in sub-paragraph iii(a) "widows and were, prior to the enlistment of those soldiers, dependent upon them," be left out with a view to insert in lieu thereof "either widowed, divorced, or deserted."

That the word "and" in sub-paragraph iv. be left out; that the words "or step-mothers," in sub-paragraph v., be left out; that the following new sub-paragraph be inserted:—"and (vi.) any person who was, prior to the death of an Australian soldier, recognised as his wife, although not legally married to him."

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Clause 48 amended to read as follows, and agreed to:—

1. The Commission may appoint Local Committees within a State or Territory.

2. The persons to be appointed as members of a Local Committee shall be selected in the prescribed manner.

3. Subject to the regulations, a Local Committee shall have power to raise and control

funds for the district for which they are appointed, and to disburse those funds within that district for the granting of assistance and benefits to any of the classes of persons specified in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the last preceding section, or to any relative or person not specified in paragraphs (b), (c), or (d) of that section who was dependent upon any deceased or discharged Australian soldier prior to his enlistment, or for any other purpose prescribed by the regulations.

4. A Local Committee shall have such other powers as are prescribed.

4A. The Commission shall appoint, for each Local Committee, an executive consisting of seven members of the Committee

4B. Five members of the executive of each Local Committee shall be nominated by the Committee, and two members shall be selected by the Commission.

5. Members of a Local Committee and of the executive of a Local Committee shall hold office during the pleasure of the Commission.

6. Any Local Committee appointed under the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Act 1917-19 shall, and the executive of any such Local Committee shall, continue as if appointed under this Act.

7. The executive of a Local Committee shall have, and may exercise—

(a) such of the powers of the Committee as are prescribed, and

(b) such other powers as are prescribed:

Provided that, in the exercise of any powers conferred in pursuance of paragraph (b) of this subsection, the executive shall be responsible only to the Commission.

Clauses 49 to 52 agreed to.

Clause 53—

The books and accounts kept—

(a) by a Local Committee, or

(b) in connexion with any repatriation fund raised prior to the passing of this Act,

shall be subject to audit as prescribed.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [2.20].—I have on more than one occasion brought before honorable members the need for the more thorough auditing of public accounts. Under the Bill as it stands, the auditing of the accounts of the Local Committees may be done by some person not under the control of the Auditor-General. In my opinion, that officer is the sole authority who can properly satisfy Parliament and the country of the correctness of public and quasi-public accounts. As one who a few years ago took a great part in forcing the Government to be more particular in requiring the auditing of the accounts by the Auditor-General's Department, I suggest that in this clause the words "as prescribed" should be left out, and the

words "by the Auditor-General" substituted for them. I do not wish to say anything about discrepancies that have occurred in the past in connexion with war funds. The Committee is aware that the auditing of the Wool Committee's accounts is done by a person who is not under the Auditor-General. I have nothing to say against outside auditors, but the accounts of that Committee and of all similar bodies should be audited by the Auditor-General's Department. I have positive evidence that some of the outside auditors have not been as careful as they might have been. Had all the accounts of the kind I have in mind been subject to audit by the Auditor-General, many improper transactions would not have continued as long as they did, because under the Audit Act there would have been a constant supervision, whereas actually the auditing was done when accounts were being closed, or upon an annual statement. Nothing can be better than the prevention of crime, and the Minister in charge of a Department, who cannot be supposed to overlook every detail of administration, has a guarantee, when provision is made for the auditing of accounts by the Auditor-General, that the money which he obtains from the Treasurer will not be wasted. Parliament should be very jealous for the proper accounting for moneys expended at its direction. The magnitude of our expenditure is in itself a special reason for very careful auditing, and the Auditor-General should control the auditing of all accounts of Government expenditure. After all, the purpose of the audit is to satisfy the Government that the accounts of these Committees are properly kept, and the moneys handled by them devoted to the proper purpose.

Mr. GROOM.—It is proposed that the audit shall be as prescribed.

Mr. WEST.—That is what I am objecting to. That would give the Repatriation Department latitude to consent to the appointment of an outside auditor.

Mr. GROOM.—The honorable member should remember that there are 700 or 800 of these Committees scattered all over the Commonwealth.

Mr. WEST.—That is but a greater justification for adopting the course I

suggest. The operations under this Bill will cover a very large area, and a very large amount of public expenditure will be involved by them. There is nothing in our laws, Federal or State, to prevent any man who pleases putting up a brass plate and describing himself as an auditor. I am sure that if the Minister will seek advice in this matter he will realize the wisdom of the amendment I suggest.

Mr. GROOM.—At the present time, wherever any Commonwealth expenditure is undertaken by these Local Committees, it is subjected to Government audit.

Mr. WEST.—I am again justified by what the honorable gentleman has said in urging that it should be made imperative by this Bill that these accounts shall be audited by the Auditor-General.

Mr. GROOM.—What I have said shows that there is no necessity for what the honorable member proposes.

Mr. WEST.—I would remind the Government that the adoption of the amendment I suggest would not prevent the Auditor-General appointing some person in any particular locality to act for him, and submit his audit to him. That is permitted by the Audit Act. No Government Department should, in a matter of this kind, be placed outside the supervision of the Auditor-General. It is said that figures do not lie, and, while that is so, our experience at election times shows that the persons who handle figures are often the greatest liars on earth.

Mr. POYNTON.—Those lies would not be approved by an auditor.

Mr. WEST.—But auditors have often been shown to be wrong in their audits. That is not to be wondered at when any man may claim to be an auditor. Are the Government prepared to adopt the suggestion I have made?

Mr. GROOM.—No; the clause is all right as it is.

Mr. WEST.—Everything is right so long as Ministers get their own way, but it is of no use for us to discuss any measures if the Government are always to have their own way. I have given sufficient reasons for the amendment I have suggested, and I therefore move—

That the words "as prescribed" be struck out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "by the Auditor-General."

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	31

Majority 16

AYES.

Blakeley, A.	Moloney, Parker
Catts, J. H.	Riley, E.
Considine, M. P.	Ryan, T. J.
Fenton, J. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Gabb, J. M.	West, J. E.
Lazzarini, H. P.	Tellers:
Mahony, W. G.	Brennan, F.
McDonald, C.	Page, James

NOES.

Atkinson, L.	Hughes, W. M.
Bell, G. J.	Lamond, Hector
Best, Sir Robert	Lister, J. H.
Blundell, R. P.	Livingston, J.
Bruce, S. M.	Mackay, G. H.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Cook, Robert	Prowse, J. H.
Corser, E. B. C.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Fleming, W. M.	Smith, Laird
Foster, Richard	Stewart, P. G.
Francis, F. H.	Wienholt, A.
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Gregory, H.	Tellers:
Groom, L. E.	Burchell, R. J.
Hill, W. C.	Story, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 54 to 56 agreed to.

Clause 57 consequentially amended and agreed to.

Postponed clause 45—

The provisions of this Act shall extend to the case of any soldier of the Imperial Reserve Forces called up for active service who at the commencement of the present state of war was *bonâ fide* resident in Australia, as if that soldier were a member of the Forces as defined in this Act:

Provided that a pension shall not be payable under this section to any person who is not *bonâ fide* resident in Australia.

Upon which Mr. BLAKELEY had moved—

That after the word "service," the following words be inserted:—

"and any Australian who is serving or has served during the present war, in the Naval or Military Forces of any part of the King's Dominions."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [2.38].—I move—

That all the words before the proviso be left out with a view to insert in lieu thereof the following:—

"The provisions of this Part shall extend to—

(a) any soldier of the Imperial Reserve Forces called up for active service during the present war; and

(b) any person who is serving or has served during the present war in the Naval or Military Forces of any part of the King's Dominions, other than the Commonwealth, on active service outside that Dominion, on proof to the satisfaction of the Commission that he was, immediately before being called up or before his enlistment, as the case may be, domiciled in the Commonwealth."

Mr. FENTON.—Exactly what is implied by the phrase, "domiciled in the Commonwealth"?

Mr. GROOM.—"Domiciled" is a legal term, in this instance implying that Australia is the man's permanent home.

Mr. TUDOR.—I was away from Australia at one time, working for some months in other countries, but I take it that throughout that period I was a *bonâ fide* Australian.

Mr. GROOM.—Had the honorable member abandoned his Australian domicile?

Mr. TUDOR.—No.

Mr. GROOM.—Then it is a question of fact in each such case.

Mr. GREGORY (Dampier) [2.41].—Would the provisions of this measure apply to an Australian-born who had lived here for many years, and had gone to some other country within the Empire, and who had served in the war, and subsequently returned to Australia?

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [2.42].—Those whom we desire to assist by the provisions of this Act are all those Australians who were *bonâ fide* resident within the Commonwealth, and domiciled here when the war broke out. If a man has been away from Australia for a few months that does not affect his domicile. But, suppose that a man had abandoned Australia as his domicile and was living in another Dominion, as a *bonâ fide* citizen of that Dominion, from which he had enlisted, and in whose Forces he had served, he would have no claim on the Commonwealth.

Mr. GREGORY.—I know of an Australian who served in the South African war, and became domiciled in Rhodesia. Soon after the late war broke out he returned to Australia and enlisted as a member of the A.I.F.

Mr. GROOM.—He will be covered by the Bill as a *bonâ fide* member of the A.I.F.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) agreed to—

That the following new clauses be inserted:—

"56A. The Commission shall furnish to the Minister annually, for presentation to the Parliament, a report of the administration and operation of this Act."

"56B. Where prior to the passing of this Act a local fund for the repatriation of Australian soldiers has been raised in any district, the control of that fund shall, subject to the regulations, be vested in the trustees for the time being of the fund."

Mr. HILL (Echuca) [2.45].—I move—

That the following new clause be inserted:—
"47A. The Commission shall have power to assist soldiers in establishing industries on a co-operative basis, such industries to include the manufacture of boots, woollen goods, and clothing, tanning, wool-scouring, fellmongering (and kindred industries), saw milling, and other enterprises."

Very many of our returned men have been placed upon the land. I have no fault to find with the land settlement policy of the Government; on the contrary, I hope it will be liberalized extensively. But I think some provision should be made for men who have no trade or calling, and my special object is to make it possible to do something for them.

Mr. POYNTON.—Do you want these co-operative enterprises to be beyond the control of the Minister?

Mr. HILL.—They might be subject to the authority of the Minister or not. A man who goes upon the land is entitled to £2,500 worth of land, and is further assisted to the extent of £625. The honorable member for Corangamite (Mr. Gibson) pointed out recently that it would cost this country £1,500,000 to repatriate 500 men by means of land settlement, and only £125,000 to repatriate the same number of men by the establishment of co-operative woollen mills for their employment; in other words, that it would cost £3,125 to repatriate one man upon the land, and only £250 in providing him with employment in a co-operative woollen mill.

Mr. GROOM.—Does the honorable member suggest how the scheme could be carried out as a co-operative enterprise, how much capital would be employed, and so forth?

Mr. HILL.—I suggest that £250 be advanced per head of those employed in

the proposed co-operative enterprise. According to the honorable member for Corangamite, this sum would be ample. There may be some doubt as to whether a woollen mill run on these lines would be profitable; but the Inter-State Commission's report showed that the net profits made by the woollen mills of the Commonwealth during the first three years of the war, actually exceeded by £50,710 the total of capital employed in 1914. The capital invested in that year in woollen mills producing blankets, flannels, &c., was £536,639, and the profits made in the three years 1915-16-17 totalled £541,135, while the capital employed in mills producing tweeds, serges, &c., was £607,746, and the profits during those three years amounted to £655,960, showing a total capital investment of £1,144,385 and profits £1,195,095.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—That was because of war conditions.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—The mills were working three shifts a day.

Mr. HILL.—The requirements of the people to-day are such that a co-operative woollen mill run by soldiers could also be worked three shifts a day and be quite as profitable.

Mr. TUDOR.—Many of the mills did not work three shifts a day because they could not get a sufficient number of employees.

Mr. HILL.—I am not here to defend the great proprietary companies. I am here to put a word in for co-operative enterprises. It goes without saying that the profits can still be made, not only by woollen mills, but by co-operative boot factories, fellmongering establishments, tanneries, wool-scouring works, saw-mills, and other similar establishments; and I would like to see some of those profits distributed amongst the rank and file. If honorable gentlemen sitting on this side of the House are deeply interested in the welfare of our returned soldiers, they now have an opportunity of proving it. I hope they will support me to the hilt, and that something will be done for those of our returned men who do not go upon the land. Will the Minister accept the new clause if the proposed enterprises are made subject to the approval of the Minister?

Mr. POYNTON.—I would like to have the proposal discussed before I express my opinion.

Mr. HILL.—During the last two or three years a large amount of sustenance money has been paid to our returned soldiers. I do not wish to indulge in recriminations, but in my opinion this problem should have been tackled two or three years ago, and instead of paying sustenance money and keeping in idleness those men who did not want to go upon the land and had no qualifications for land settlement, they should have been placed in the Commonwealth Woollen Mills or other private concerns to learn a trade and been paid a living wage, so that by the time they had become proficient, factories would have been erected and machinery installed.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—Men are being trained already.

Mr. HILL.—I am aware of that, and there is good reason why we should continue training and employing these men by means of co-operative enterprises. If these industries are established, I hope that they will be set up as far as possible in country towns, with a view to bringing about decentralization. Honorable members opposite must recognise that the population of our capital cities is quite out of proportion—the disproportion is growing to an alarming extent—and we should be only too pleased to receive any support in the movement towards decentralization.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey—Minister for Home and Territories) [2.56].—The honorable member has referred to what he describes as a fearful waste of money in connexion with the payment of sustenance to returned soldiers.

Mr. HILL.—I did not say that the money was wasted. I maintained that it could be better employed.

Mr. POYNTON.—When we realize that the average payment of sustenance to each soldier has been £8 5s., hardly exceeding a period of three weeks, it will be seen that expenditure in this direction has not been extravagant, especially when it is compared with the services the men have rendered Australia. The bulk of this money has been paid during one of the most troublesome periods we have had in Australia for many years past; that is

to say, during the influenza outbreak and the seamen's and marine engineers' strikes. Not only have we been obliged to sustain returned soldiers who were thrown out of employment because of these industrial troubles, but we have also had to provide relief for thousands of people in the State of Victoria.

The honorable member for Echuca (Mr. Hill) must know that the Repatriation Department can only train as many men as the trade unions will permit.

Mr. HILL.—No trade union would object to the employment of 100 men in the Commonwealth Woollen Mills.

Mr. POYNTON.—It was only last week that the Castlemaine moulders objected to the employment of one trainee to every six journeymen. They would not allow more than one trainee to about thirty journeymen.

If the Government had come down with this proposal, it would have been described as one of the most Socialistic ever put forward. Three men, over whom we have practically no control, are to be allowed to commit the country to the expenditure of millions of pounds without any check upon them.

Mr. HILL.—I am willing to include the words "subject to the approval of the Minister."

Mr. POYNTON.—In any case, the clause is unnecessary, because the Repatriation Commissioners will be perfectly entitled to give consideration to such projects. The proposed new clause would make it mandatory on them to accede to them. The honorable member has put forward a simple illustration in regard to the establishment of a co-operative woollen mill, with, perhaps, a capital of £1,000,000; but his proposal covers not only woollen mills, but also boot factories, clothing factories, canning factories, and, in fact, it is so worded as to cover almost any enterprise under the sun. The Government cannot agree to any proposal which would commit the country in this way to the expenditure of scores of millions of pounds.

Mr. HILL.—We have not sufficient returned soldiers to absorb scores of millions of pounds.

Mr. POYNTON.—There is no suggestion of any limitation as to the number of factories. If we start a woollen mill

in Geelong, why should not one be started in Bendigo or Ballarat, or any other centre? If we establish a factory in one State there would be a call upon us to establish similar factories in other States. In the circumstances, I cannot consent to the honorable member's proposal as it stands.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.0].—I understand that the honorable member for Echuca (Mr. Hill) is quite willing to have the words "subject to the approval of the Minister" inserted in the clause. When the first Repatriation Bill was before this House, I pointed out that the man on the land was to be treated in an infinitely better way than the man who was engaged in an industry in a city. I consider the proposal of the honorable member a step in the right direction, because I hold that every man should be placed on the same footing.

Mr. FENTON.—What is the difference between providing money for a woollen mill and finding it for a man who is anxious to go on the land?

Mr. TUDOR.—There is no difference whatever. The proposal of the honorable member for Echuca is on the lines of that put forward by the honorable members for Swan (Mr. Prowse), and Adelaide (Mr. Blundell), for the establishment of co-operative concerns by returned soldiers utilizing their war gratuity bonds. They are already doing this in Geelong. The Minister says that the proposal before us is socialistic; but surely we have all got beyond being frightened by that name, as applied to any project. If this new clause will provide an opportunity for returned soldiers to co-operate for the purpose of doing something for themselves and Australia, we shall be taking a step in the right direction by including it in the Bill.

Mr. STEWART (Wimmera) [3.3].—The object of the proposal of the honorable member for Echuca (Mr. Hill) is to make provision for those men who, prior to the war, were not engaged in farming or in some business calling. A man who was a farmer before the war is placed on the land on his return; the man who was in a small business before he went to the war is placed in business again on his return, and the man who wielded a pick and shovel before he went overseas is given a pick and shovel on his return. The farm labourer who worked for a weekly wage

is, on his return, put on the land, and placed in a position to become his own employer, but what is done for the man who, before enlisting, worked for a saw-miller for a weekly wage? He is sent back to the sawmill under the old boss who was having a comfortable time while his employee was away fighting. In his remarks, the Minister (Mr. Poynton), as is often done by honorable gentlemen on the front bench, dealt with details, getting quite away from the vital principle at issue. We admit that there are obstacles in the way of the adoption of our proposal, but we are quite prepared to agree to any safeguard the Minister may think fit.

These returned men should be given an opportunity, and I shall give an illustration of what I mean. When I was in the country the other day, I was in conversation with a number of men wearing military badges who were working at a saw-mill at a railway siding. They were engaged by an employer at a weekly wage, and I asked them whether, if provision were made for an advance from the Repatriation Department to enable them to purchase an engine, a bench and a few drays, they could not run a plant of their own. They replied emphatically in the affirmative, and said they would be only too glad to undertake the work on their own account if they could obtain the necessary capital. It is to cover such cases as this that we are endeavouring to incorporate this amendment in the Bill. We do not desire the measure to be amended in such a way that any one could come along and ask for an advance to launch some wild-cat scheme, and we are quite agreeable to accept any reasonable safeguards. The bulk of the men in the Australian Imperial Force before they went to the war were working for others. What have the Government done for the bulk of them? That is a question I desire the Government to consider, and I also appeal very strongly to those honorable members in this Chamber who are wearing military badges to support this reasonable proposition.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [3.7].—I trust the Government will see their way clear to deal with the amendment in a sympathetic manner, as the proposal is a reasonable one and cannot be regarded

as a communistic experiment or anything of that nature. The proposal in the amendment is confined to co-operative businesses, which, after all, are voluntary associations of men carrying on industries for the benefit of themselves and the whole community. It is to be regretted that the co-operative system has not become more widely established in Australia. Objections may be raised to this proposal, and although the amendment may not be in the form the Government desire, the principle is a perfectly sound one. Criticisms have been made concerning the Repatriation Department or the administration of the Act, because proper provision has not been made to advance money to soldiers who desire to start in business. Although many of the men who went to the Front were employees before they left Australia, as stated by the honorable member for Wimmera (Mr. Stewart), there are many who would by now have been in business on their own account if they had not gone abroad in the interests of Empire.

Mr. POYNTON.—Would it meet the wish of the honorable member if the Government agreed to insert after the word "shall" the words "subject to the approval of the Minister"?

Mr. JOWETT.—I understand that the honorable member for Echuca (Mr. Hill) is prepared to accept the Assistant Minister's suggested amendment.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am willing to do that.

Mr. HILL.—But we will want something done.

Mr. JOWETT.—I am indebted to the Acting Minister for Repatriation for his offer, and I trust that the proposal of the honorable member for Echuca will have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER (Wakefield) [3.10].—I agree entirely with the object of establishing co-operative concerns, but I do not want the soldiers and the taxpayers generally to believe that we are providing for something which will not really exist.

Mr. FENTON.—I hope we are sincere, and that this is not to be regarded as a sham.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I hope the honorable member is sincere. This is entirely a financial question.

Mr. JOWETT.—It will be subject to the approval of the Minister.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I object to placing placards, supposed to embody principles, on our statute-book when they are not on a sound basis.

Mr. GIBSON.—Is not land settlement on a sound basis?

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Yes, and I shall tell the honorable member why.

Mr. JOWETT.—The Assistant Minister has already agreed to the proposal.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I do not care, and I appeal to the honorable member for Grampians, who knows something about business, to say whether this is not the crudest proposition ever conceived by a responsible Parliament. I desire to know whether we have any authority, as representatives of the people, to assist in undertakings under the crude proposal before the House. It is an impossible proposition when considered from the financial aspect. Let honorable members who are so keen to include this provision in the Bill interview the heads of any financial institution and ask them if they are prepared to advance money on the basis of the proposal now before us. My entire sympathy is with the movement, but it must have some foundation. Comparison has been made between land settlement and the proposal of the honorable member for Echuca. While there is a risk of losing perhaps hundreds of thousands, or even millions, sterling in connexion with land settlement, the risk under this proposition is ten times greater.

Mr. HILL.—No.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I say, it is. The land is there and cannot be removed. Land settlement is totally different from entering into businesses of various kinds and competing with commercial undertakings that have been established for years and are under highly-efficient control.

Mr. JOWETT.—The Government will look after that.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I am sure my honorable friend knows that in connexion with our land settlement problem there are painful instances where

men who have gone on the land and have accepted advances from the Department have been all right while the money was coming in, but when that ceased they have walked off their holdings and told the Department to take the land. I urge the Committee not to raise false hopes, by introducing into the Bill a scheme involving an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds, which is not on a sound basis.

Mr. GIBSON.—It will be the fault of the Commissioners if any mistake is made; they will have power to investigate every case.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Everything will depend upon the class of Commissioners we secure. Surely honorable members are not going to behave like school children, and put forward a scheme that is not likely to be a credit to the Parliament.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [3.16].—The attitude of the honorable member for Wakefield (Mr. Richard Foster), who has just resumed his seat, reminds me of the old couplet—

Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me downstairs?

The Minister has said that the average sustenance allowance extends over three weeks. That means that each individual receives £6 6s., and as 300,000 men have returned, a total of over £1,800,000 has been paid by way of sustenance. Can any one say that there is anything to show for the money thus expended?

Mr. GROOM.—Does the honorable gentleman agree with the payment of sustenance money?

Dr. MALONEY.—I do; but not in the miserable way that has been followed by the Department. I am glad that this amendment has been moved by the honorable member for Echuca. When a number of poor fellows, most of them maimed, were earning a few paltry shillings a week at the Anzac weaving school, the wonderful Department of Repatriation used to deduct from their sustenance allowance of £2 2s. a week the paltry 15s. a week that was accruing to the men by way of pension. That was not done in Sydney, where the industry is carried on under the auspices of the Red Cross. But for the Repatriation Department, and the influence of Flinders-lane, there would be in Victoria to-day 1,000 men engaged in the Anzac tweed industry.

Amendment of the amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) proposed—

That after the word "shall," line 1, the words "subject to the approval of the Minister" be inserted.

Mr. ROBERT COOK (Indi) [3.22].—

I am not at all pleased with the way in which this question has been discussed, since there has been on all sides a display of bitterness that we have no desire to arouse. I am a staunch believer in co-operation, and as the result of twenty years' experience of it in Victoria, I am able to say that it has been attended with splendid results. I am associated at the present time with six very successful co-operative enterprises, with a turnover of £250,000 a year. I visited the Repatriation Trades School, Wirth's Park, a few days ago, and saw with interest what is being done in the vocational training of returned men. The work is a distinct credit to the Minister. Many of them are rapidly becoming efficient, and, in the near future, will be splendid tradesmen. A man who is learning the trade of a blacksmith, after four months' experience, was turning out work equal to that of an apprentice of two years' standing. The amendment simply proposes that these men shall go on earning for themselves instead of making profits for employers. We feel that there is ample room for a very wide extension of the principle of co-operation, and that, under the wise guidance of the Minister, there is no likelihood of waste and extravagance. If the Minister cannot supervise co-operative ventures such as we propose, then how will it be possible for him to supervise other enterprises involving a considerable expenditure for which provision is made in this Bill. I hope that the amendment will not be dealt with in a party spirit, but that a united effort will be made to give these men real, sound, practical assistance through the channel of co-operation.

Mr. GIBSON (Corangamite) [3.24].—

The Minister has practically agreed to the amendment, subject to the insertion of the words "subject to the approval of the Minister." I am inclined to think that the word "Commissioners" instead of "Minister" should be employed.

Mr. TUDOR.—All of these projects will involve an expenditure of over £5,000,

and must therefore be referred to the Minister.

Mr. GIBSON.—This is not a Socialistic movement. It is simply a scheme to enable returned soldiers in certain districts to combine so that they will secure the same help that is given to those who go on the land. Every man will then have a chance of entering into some concern that will be of advantage to himself. The honorable member for Indi (Mr. Robert Cook) referred to what is being done in the way of vocational training at Wirth's Park. Very fine work is being done there, simply to enable these men to become servants of other men. We want to make them masters, not servants. I am surprised at the attitude of the honorable member for Wakefield (Mr. Foster), who waxed very eloquent on behalf of vested interests. If these men are given an opportunity they will form themselves into little companies, which will be an absolute success. The Government never had a better opportunity than the present to enter into this undertaking in the proper spirit. Little groups of men trained at Wirth's Park could be given contracts for some of the houses being built to-day. They are actually building those houses, but are only getting wages out of them, while somebody else is reaping the profits. There are scores of saw-mill hands working in forest areas who only need to be advanced about £250 each, instead of the £2,500 advanced in other cases, and then the Government can let them as many contracts as they like to cut timber for the housing scheme. That decidedly should be done. The men are absolutely efficient, and know the job of saw-milling quite as well as the men who run the mills. These are some of the small schemes which this measure should be passed to promote. We should give returned men facilities to establish manufacturing undertakings in some of the decadent mining towns, and by that means the whole of the existing housing problem could be solved. The houses I looked at the other day are costing about £700 each. The Government could obtain houses equal to them for half, or even a quarter, of the money in some of the mining districts. Those centres are admirably suited for small co-operative companies run by returned soldiers. I

hope the Government will see to these things, which are necessary in the interests of the men who cannot possibly go on the land. The honorable member for Wakefield spoke of the men on the land. The Government are placing £650 worth of improvements on 60 acres of ground. The result is to bring up the value of that ground by £10 per acre. In some cases the land is not worth it when that £10 per acre improvement is placed upon it.

Amendment (Mr. POYNTON's) agreed to.

Proposed new clause, as amended, agreed to.

First Schedule—

GENERAL PENSIONS RATES.

Scale of Pensions payable to Widow or Widowed Mother on Death of a Member of the Forces, or to a Member, or to the Wife of a Member, upon his total Incapacity.

Where the rate of pay of a member of the Forces exceeds a rate shown in column one of this schedule, and is less than the next higher rate in that column, the rates of pensions payable for the purposes of columns two and three shall be computed by adding to the rate of pension shown in those columns opposite to the next lower rate of pay the sum which bears to the difference between that rate of pension and the next higher rate of pension shown in those columns the proportion which the difference between the rate of pay received by the member and the next lower rate of pay shown in column one bears to the difference between the next lower and the next higher rates of pay in that column.

Amendment (by Mr. GROOM) agreed to—

That after the word "payable" (line 2) the words "subject to the provisions of the Third Schedule" be inserted.

Mr. PROWSE (Swan) [3.30].—I have racked my brains to understand the meaning of the concluding paragraph of this schedule, but have not been able to do so. I do not know how those who will need to use the Bill will fare unless it is put in simpler form. Will the Minister explain what it means?

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [3.31].—The paragraph expresses the existing law. In the first column of the schedule certain rates of pay per day of the member of the Forces are set out, and in the other columns are set out the corresponding pension rates. This paragraph simply provides that where a rate of pay existed between any of the amounts set

down in the first column, the rates of pension in the other columns shall be assessed proportionately.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Second Schedule—

RATE FOR SPECIAL PENSIONS—£8 PER FORTNIGHT.

The Special Rate of Pension may be granted to members of the Forces who have been blinded as the result of War Service, and to members who are totally and permanently incapacitated, (*i.e.*, incapacitated for life to such an extent as to be precluded from earning other than a negligible percentage of a living wage).

The Special Rate of Pension shall not be payable to any pensioners who are maintained in an establishment at the public expense.

In the case of a member who has been granted the Special Rate of Pension, the wife of such member shall not be entitled to receive a pension exceeding the rate specified in column five of the First Schedule opposite the rate of pay of the member.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [3.32].—I shall not propose the amendment which I have circulated, but instead beg to move—

That after the first paragraph the following new paragraph be inserted:—

"The Commissioner may grant a pension not exceeding the special rate of pension to any member of the Forces who is suffering from tuberculosis and who has been for at least six months an inmate of an establishment for persons so suffering, and has been discharged from that establishment. Provided that this paragraph shall not authorize the grant of a pension to any member of the Forces unless upon his discharge from the establishment the medical officer in charge of that establishment has certified that such discharge is not a menace to public health."

Mr. POYNTON.—I accept the amendment.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.33].—The amendment provides that a person suffering from tubercular disease has to be discharged from the establishment before he can receive the pension. He may be a married man, and the special rate of pension would, of course, be for the benefit of his family. It would be dangerous to grant it only if the man was discharged. We should not encourage persons suffering from this disease to be discharged amongst the community. While I have as much sympathy with these sufferers as has any other honorable member, I believe it is recognised by the medical authorities that they are a menace to the public health unless properly looked

after. It is far better for them and for other people that they should be kept in a sanatorium.

Mr. GROOM.—The patient has to get a certificate from the medical officer that his discharge is not a menace to the public health.

Mr. TUDOR.—The amendment is a rephrasing of the original one of which notice was given by the honorable member for Illawarra. It is dangerous to compel the men to be discharged from the sanatorium. I understand that if the pension is paid to men while they are inmates of an institution, the bulk of it is retained by the institution. In Victoria, the Department has adopted a very bad policy by sending the men who were at Mont Park, where tubercular cases were treated, to the Austin Hospital for Incurables, and placing them in the Kronheimer wing, which is the finest part of the institution. It is bad for the soldiers to be kept amongst incurables, and the policy is bad for the people, because it prevents other incurables from obtaining admission. The hardships experienced overseas caused many of our men to develop tubercular troubles, and I believe in doing everything possible to help them. I approve of paying the pension to them, but I do not like the provision that they shall not get it until they are discharged from the institution. It is better for them to be in a sanatorium, because they have a better chance of recovery, and are not so much a menace to the community.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [3.38].—The position as it has been explained to me is that any inmate of an institution who is able to obtain employment can leave at any time and mix with the general community without restraint, whereas men who are unable to obtain employment must remain in the institution or starve. The object of the amendment is to give to them an opportunity of returning to their homes for the purpose of continuing the treatment. It is admitted that the institutions are conducted in the best possible way, but the inmates say that they are continually coming in contact with people similarly afflicted, and they can never forget that they are tubercular cases.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is why I object to their being put in the Austin Hospital.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—That will be altered shortly; the Department will

provide effectively for such cases being treated in the country under different conditions. The object I have in view is to enable tubercular patients who are not able to work to get the same attention as they would be able to get if they were living at home amongst their own people, if in the opinion of the medical officer of the institution there was no special danger to the community in allowing them to return to their homes. The reason for the provision that patients must remain in an institution for six months is that in that period they may learn how to avoid spreading contagion to others. I am assured by the Medical Superintendent that it is quite safe for these patients to mix with other people so long as they have been properly trained to look after themselves. At any rate, whether or not there is a danger in what is proposed, the present position is that the man who has money may go to his home, whilst the man dependent upon the low rate of pension at present paid has to remain in the institution, and in his own judgment has not the same chance to recover as he would have if he could join his own people in his home.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [3.40].—I approve of the amendment, which is an improvement upon the present practice, but I do not understand why we should compel an invalid to remain in an institution for six months if, at the end of one month, he is fit to be discharged. However, I am willing to give the proposal a trial, and if we find that it tends to counteract the benefits conferred by the clause, we ought to be able to amend it.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Third Schedule—

Class of person eligible for pension.

Rate of pension payable.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [3.44].—In order to meet the case of widows, or unmarried mothers of members born out of wedlock, I move—

That the following paragraph be inserted—

“Widowed or unmarried mother of an unmarried member who was born out of wedlock and who was brought up by her.”

“The rate specified in column two of the First Schedule, provided that, in the case of a widow, she became a widow, either prior to, or within three years after, the death of the member.”

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [3.45].—I have in mind the case of an unmarried mother whose son went to the war. At the time of his departure for the Front he was not living with her, and she cannot prove her dependence upon him.

Mr. GROOM.—The question of dependency does not arise. If she brought up the boy she is in the same position as is a married mother.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Fourth Schedule—

Any member of the Forces who is incapacitated by reason of a disability specified in the first column of this Schedule shall receive the rate of pension shown in the second column of this Schedule opposite the description of the disability.

Amendment (by **Mr. POYNTON**) agreed to—

That all the words after "disability" (second occurring) be left out, with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following schedule:—

Description of Disability.	Rate of Permanent Pension payable. Percentage of rate in column 4 in First Schedule opposite Member's Rate of Pay.
	Per centum
Loss of two or more limbs . . .	100
Loss of both eyes . . .	100
Loss of one eye, together with loss of leg, foot, hand or arm . . .	100
Loss of both arms . . .	100
Loss of both legs . . .	100
Loss of both feet . . .	100
Loss of both hands . . .	100
Loss of hand and foot . . .	100
Loss of all fingers and thumbs . .	100
Lunacy . . .	100
Wounds, injuries, or disease, involving total permanent disabling effects . . .	100
Very severe facial disfigurement . .	100
Amputation of leg at hip, or of right arm at shoulder joint (if right handed), or of left arm at shoulder joint (if left handed) . . .	100 for first six months 80 thereafter
Severe facial disfigurement . . .	80
Total loss of speech . . .	80
Loss of leg or foot . . .	100 for first six months 75 thereafter
Loss of arm or hand . . .	100 for first six months 75 thereafter
Total deafness . . .	70
Loss of vision in one eye . . .	50

For the purposes of this Schedule a leg, foot, hand, arm or eye is deemed to be lost if it is rendered permanently and wholly useless.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY (Hume) [3.47].—I move—

That the Bill be now recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering clause 22, with a view to inserting before the word "In" at the beginning of the clause the words "That this part of this Act be administered by the existing Pensions Department."

Mr. GROOM.—That question has been fought out.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I am adopting this course because the matter is one of great importance. The Bill seeks to create a new and unnecessary Department, and I do not wish the occasion to pass without honorable members being afforded an ample opportunity of saying whether or not they approve of this undesirable course. The present Pensions Department has already done three-fourths of this work, and has done it exceedingly well. The only reason which the Minister has assigned in favour of the creation of a new Department is that it will effect economy in the matter of time. From my stand-point, it will have precisely the opposite result. It is proposed to take from a Department which has all the necessary machinery at its disposal work which it is now performing, and to give it to a Department which has no machinery whatever. The Government say they are pledged to economy; this retrograde step is the very antithesis of their promises to the electors.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [3.51].—In seconding the amendment, I congratulate the honorable member for Hume upon the course which he has taken, particularly in view of the importance of the principle which is involved and of the very close division which took place in this Committee last evening. In the majority which the Government commanded on that occasion were included two members of the party who, so far as this country has been informed, stand for economy—I refer to the Deputy Leader of the Country party, the honorable member for Grammians (Mr. Jowett) and the honorable member for Swan (Mr. Prowse). I particularly call attention to this fact, because it is not the first occasion upon

which I have noticed that certain members of the Country party make it convenient to see that the Government obtain a majority whenever the latter are in a tight corner. Now an opportunity will be given them to say whether they really stand for economy or not. The honorable member for Hume put the position very clearly when he said that in this Bill the Government propose to establish two Pensions Departments where only one existed previously. I hope that the amendment will be carried.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs)—Minister for Works and Railways [3.53].—The Government will oppose this amendment, because the issue that is involved in it was definitely decided last evening in a full Committee. Upon that occasion the argument was advanced—just as it has been this afternoon—that the Bill provides for the creation of two Departments. It does nothing of the sort. The position is that there are a number of officers of the Old-age Pensions Department who are charged with administrative work in connexion with soldiers' pensions, and because of difficulties which may arise in affording all kinds of relief to soldiers and their dependants, these officers are about to be placed under the control of the Repatriation Commission.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—There is to be only one set of records and one correspondence branch.

Mr. GROOM.—Exactly, and an important aspect is the medical side of the question. The activities of the Defence Department in this connexion are about to cease, and instead of creating a new Department, as has been alleged, we are merely transferring certain officers in order to insure efficient and economical administration. Those honorable members who have been taunted with failure to keep their pledges by insisting upon economy in our public Departments, have shown that they are the truest advocates of economy. That, however, is a policy which is entirely foreign to the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan). We have had constant complaints from outside. Persons who are granted war pensions are under the impression that these represent all they are entitled to; and the desire is that pensions and

repatriation assistance shall be granted at the same time by the one body.

Mr. MAHONY.—Why "stone-wall" your own Bill?

Mr. GROOM.—I am not "stone-wall" the Bill; but I refuse to permit the public to be misled by statements which are grossly inaccurate.

Mr. RYAN.—The public will not be misled.

Mr. GROOM.—If they take the honorable member's statements at their face value they will be misled. I do not say that the honorable member desires to mislead, but that he is under a misapprehension as to the actual facts.

Mr. RYAN.—I am satisfied to leave that to the judgment of the public.

Mr. GROOM.—Under the circumstances, I have every confidence in asking the House to reject the motion.

Question.—That the Bill be recommitted (Mr. PARKER MOLONEY's motion)—put. The House divided.

Ayes	23
Noes	32

Majority 9

AYES.

Blakeley, A.	McDonald, C.
Brennan, F.	Moloney, Parker
Catts, J. H.	Prowse, J. H.
Considine, M. P.	Ryan, T. J.
Fenton, J. E.	Stewart, P. G.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Hill, W. C.	Watkins, D.
Lazzarini, H. P.	West, J. E.
Mahony, W. G.	Wienholt, A.
Makin, N. J. O.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, Dr.	Page, James
Mathews, J.	Riley, E.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.	Higgs, W. G.
Bamford, F. W.	Hughes, W. M.
Bell, G. J.	Lamond, Hector
Best, Sir Robert	Lister, J. H.
Blundell, R. P.	Livingston, J.
Bruce, S. M.	Mackay, G. H.
Cameron, D. C.	Marks, W. M.
Chanter, J. M.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Corser, E. B. C.	Rodgers, A. S.
Fleming, W. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Foster, Richard	Smith, Laird
Fowler, J. M.	Wise, G. H.
Francis, F. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Greene, W. M.	Burchell, R. J.
Gregory, H.	Story, W. H.
Groom, L. E.	

Question so resolved in the negative.

Standing Orders suspended, and report adopted.

THIRD READING.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) proposed—

This Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. JAMES PAGE (Maranoa) [4.2].—

Before the Bill leaves the Chamber I desire to say a few words in reference to a particular class of returned soldiers. The newspapers tell us every day that men have returned from the war physically wrecked and mentally deficient. I cannot speak of other States, but in Queensland there is no place to which these men can be sent, in order that they may be restored to health and made the reputable citizens many of them were before they left for the Front. Many of them are drinking about the big cities, and I should like the Repatriation Department to provide an asylum to which they can be committed, instead of permitting them, as at present, to be sent to gaol. It is the wish of every honorable member, and of all the people of Australia, to do the right thing by these men. It grieves me to think that soldiers, who have made this country safe for us all—and but for whose services things might have been very different to-day—should, in their broken state, be sent to gaol. The police magistrate in Brisbane was very pained when I pleaded for a man who, after four years' fighting, had been arrested as a vagrant. He said, "There is nowhere else for me to send this man but to gaol." Of course, the man was down and out. He was covered with vermin, and a complete human wreck. It behoves us to do what we can for these men. I know that those at the head of the Repatriation administration, both in the States and in the Central Department, are sympathetic, and I appeal to them to get to work as early as they can, to save this human wreckage, and, if possible, bring it back to normal civil life. If these men could be sent to a military hostel, where they would enjoy a certain amount of freedom, but be kept from the cursed drink, some of them would be reclaimed, and if only 5 per cent. of them were thus saved, it would be a good thing for them and for the country.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [4.7].—I am sure that what has been said by the honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page) makes an appeal to every one of us. The Department is taking action in each of the States on the lines

that he wishes to have followed, and at Mount Gravatt, in Queensland, an establishment is being created to meet the cases to which he has referred. Instructions have been given that the man whom he has mentioned shall not be sent to gaol, and shall be properly cared for.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [4.8].—In my opinion, it is desirable that the Government should establish some sort of soldier force—not policemen exactly, but welfare men—whose business it would be to go about the cities, and get hold of soldiers before their state became so bad as to bring them into the hands of the civil police. Nothing hurts me more than to see uniformed men being taken by civilian policemen to a lock-up. A force such as I suggest would look after these men in the fraternal way that their mates would care for them, and, no doubt, prevent many of them from getting into trouble, brought about by the strain of war work, from which they have not yet recovered. I suggest some voluntary or paid organization for the service of those who have done so much for us.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.11].—I am glad that the honorable member for Maranoa has raised this question. Cases like that which he mentioned have occurred in all the States, and members on both sides must have come into contact with a great many of them. In some cases, the men are mental as well as physical wrecks.

Mr. FLEMING.—That is nearly always so.

Mr. TUDOR.—We should provide homes for these men, where they might be subjected to a certain amount of wholesome discipline, and protected from themselves. Even when the hotels of this city were closed during a large part of the day, or altogether, as during the influenza outbreak, those people whom the Prime Minister has designated harpies and sharks often got hold of soldiers, and deliberately drugged some of them, I believe. I trust that what the Minister says is being done in Queensland—

Mr. GROOM.—Similar action is being taken in all the States.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Department could not do better than try to assist in every way these men who are broken in mind and spirit by the strain of war.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE CANTEENS FUNDS BILL.

Bill received from the Senate, and (on motion by Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE) read a first time.

PAPER.

The following paper was presented—

Northern Territory—Ordinance of 1920, No. 1—Tin Dredging.

ADJOURNMENT.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TUDOR.—What business is it proposed to take next week?

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [4.12].—The business at present on the paper; I cannot now say the exact order. One of the first matters to be considered is the Senate's message regarding the War Gratuity Bill. A motion to enable Parliament to record its appreciation of the services of our soldiers in connexion with the recent war will be submitted early next week, and there will be motions referring works proposals to the Public Works Committee.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 4.13 p.m.

Senate.

Wednesday, 28 April, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

Northern Territory.—Ordinance No. 1 of 1920.—Tin Dredging.

War Service Homes Act.—Land acquired for War Service Homes purposes at—

Goulburn, New South Wales (three notifications).

Launceston, Tasmania.

Mayfield, New South Wales.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) announced the receipt of a

message from the House of Representatives, acquainting the Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act, of the appointment of the following members of the House of Representatives to that Committee:—Messrs. Atkinson, Bamford, Gregory, Mackay, Mathews, and Parker Moloney.

AUSTRALIAN SOLDIERS' REPATRIATION BILL.

Bill returned from the House of Representatives.

TARIFF.

CONSIDERATION BY SENATE.

Senator KEATING asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Will the Government, to expedite final parliamentary adoption of a Customs Tariff, arrange to have the several divisions of the proposed Tariff submitted to the Senate as soon as each such division has been respectively dealt with by the House of Representatives?

Senator MILLEN.—Careful consideration has been given to the proposal of the honorable senator, but the difficulties in the way of its adoption appear to be insuperable.

APPORTIONMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY WORK.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Senator KEATING asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

With a view to the due apportionment of the work of the session between Senate and House of Representatives, will the Government cause the proposed Bill to amend the Public Service Act to be originated in the Senate?

Senator MILLEN.—The apportionment of work between the two Houses of this Parliament is now under the consideration of the Government.

PUBLIC SERVICE.

MR. JUSTICE POWERS' INCREMENTS AWARD
—PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS' AWARD.

Senator SENIOR asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate, *upon notice*—

1. What interpretation is applied to the proviso to clause 2 of Mr. Justice Powers' award

of 1st October, 1919 (proviso, page 24 of award—dealing with increment of £12 to Class 5 of public servants)?

2. By what means is "eligibility" determined?

3. What is the standard of "efficiency" as applied to 5th Class officers?

4. Is it "efficiency" in 5th Class duties or "efficiency" 4th Class—

(a) minimum,

(b) maximum?

5. Is the standard of efficiency uniform throughout the whole of the class, or—

(a) dissimilar in various Departments,

(b) uniform in each of the States?

6. By what means is the standard determined—

(a) by examination,

(b) by opinion of Commissioner; if so, on what basis is such opinion arrived at?

Senator MILLEN.—The answers are—

1 to 5. The only matter involving interpretation is "eligibility by efficiency." "Efficiency" is defined as special qualifications and aptitude for the discharge of duties in the 4th Class, in accordance with the particular requirements of the Department concerned.

6. The Commissioner is the determining authority under the award. His decisions are based upon official and inspectorial reports.

Senator KEATING asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. The date or dates of the Arbitration Court award or awards in respect of professional officers in the Commonwealth Public Service?

2. Are the terms of same applicable and applied to professional officers in the Commonwealth Public Works Department and the Naval Works Department?

Senator MILLEN. — The answers are—

1. The Professional Officers Association award operated from 17th June, 1918.

2. This award is only applicable to officers of the Public Works Department, whose positions are specifically mentioned in the award. Officers of the Naval Works Branch are not included in the award.

WAR GRATUITY.

CASHING OF BONDS OF COMMONWEALTH PUBLIC SERVANTS.

Senator BARNES asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate, *upon notice*—

Is it the intention of the Government to cash the War Gratuity Bonds held by its employees, before the end of 1920?

Senator MILLEN.—Yes, in those cases where the employees desire cash.

INTERNEES.

NUMBER OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN AND BRITISH-BORN—GERMAN RESIDENTS OF RABAU.

Senator GARDINER asked the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

1. How many Australian-born were interned between 4th August, 1914, and 11th November, 1918?

2. How many British-born were interned during same period?

3. How many Australian-born were interned between 1st August, 1914, and 31st December, 1916?

4. How many British-born were interned during same period?

Senator PEARCE.—The answers are—

1. Fifty-nine.

2. One.

3. Forty.

4. Nil.

In replying to a question of the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, on the 10th March, the number of natural-born Australians of enemy descent interned during the war was given as thirty-one. This was taken from a prepared list of natural-born subjects interned, but proper account had not been taken of those who had been released at various periods, and whose names were not on this list. The files of all such natural-born internees have now been gone through, and the above figures may be taken as accurate.

Senator GARDINER asked the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

1. How many German residents from Rabaul were interned during the war?

2. How many of these were land-holders?

3. How many have had their lands confiscated?

4. Will the Government lay on the table of the Senate the evidence taken in every case where men were deported and their lands confiscated?

Senator PEARCE.—The answers are—

1. One hundred and fifty-four.

2. Twenty-five are described as plantation or land owners.

3. None.

4. See (3).

IMMIGRATION BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed from 23rd April, *vide* page 1486):

Clause 3 (Prohibited immigrants).

Progress reported.

PASSPORTS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.10].—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This measure is for practical purposes a continuation of the main regulations under the War Precautions Act with regard to the issue of passports. It provides that any person over sixteen years of age, on leaving the Commonwealth, must have a passport. Because of the action now taken in nearly every other country in the world in the detention of people under passport regulations it would be very difficult for any one to travel from this country to any other without a passport. In that regard, therefore, it will be largely a matter of convenience. Persons entering Australia will be dealt with under the Immigration Act. This Bill deals mainly with the issue of passports which will prove a convenience to any Australian travelling abroad. A passport will last for two years, but there are provisions in the measure which permit of its extension to meet the convenience of the public. Clause 4 deals with arrangements which may be made with foreign countries in regard to transport. It provides that where there is a mutual understanding that there shall be freedom of intercourse between different countries, exemptions may be granted. Though the provisions of the Bill are intended to apply only to a few persons there is no doubt that its powers are very far-reaching. It is not likely, however, that they will be used to the full extent. The measure will be administered as sympathetically as possible. Clause 5 provides that any person entering Australia who is required to be in possession of a passport shall, if required, give up his passport to an officer before leaving the vessel by which he has entered the Commonwealth. The passports of British people and of other races who are deemed desirable will be immediately stamped, so that they will be subject to no further disability than that imposed by having a check upon their entry here. Clause 7 makes it a legal offence for the master of a vessel to discharge any alien seaman who signed on outside the Commonwealth, and who has not lodged his passport with an officer as provided for under this Bill. We have evidence that many undesirable are coming to Australia who have signed on as seamen outside the Commonwealth, and whose entry here it is deemed wise to check. Thus the responsibility is placed upon the master of

Senator Russell.

the vessel by which they travel to protect the Commonwealth. Clause 9 provides that any person who, for the purpose of obtaining a passport, makes any false or misleading statement shall be guilty of an offence, the penalty for which is £100, or imprisonment for six months. Probably there will be a difference of opinion in regard to the necessity for the issue of passports to some persons leaving Australia. But it cannot be denied that in the present condition of affairs it will be a distinct advantage for people going abroad to be fully armed with what is practically a credential which will facilitate their progress in any other part of the world. Of course, legislation of this character calls for sympathetic administration. Upon the other hand, where foreign countries debar our own people from entering them without passports, we should stand, at least, upon the same footing. Where, however, no suspicion is involved, full power is conferred by the Bill to practically abolish passports. The desire all the time is to facilitate the movements of the travelling public. This is the second occasion upon which the Bill has been before the Senate, and it is generally recognised that it is largely a measure for consideration in Committee. If honorable senators are not prepared to proceed with the debate upon its second reading to-day I am quite willing to agree to an adjournment.

Senator SENIOR. — Will it cover the Pacific Islands over which Australia has a mandate?

Senator RUSSELL.—When we get control of them, it will probably cover all the islands of the Pacific, and particularly those which are liable to foreign invasion.

Debate (on motion by Senator GARDINER) adjourned.

ALIENS REGISTRATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria — Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.17].—This is another old friend upon which we had many long debates last session. It is based upon the recommendations made by the Committee appointed during the war period to deal with the registration of aliens. A number of honorable senators were members

of that Committee, and this measure will perpetuate very many of the restrictions that have hitherto obtained in regard to the registration of aliens. It provides that no alien shall be permitted to enter this country without registering and without giving full particulars in regard to his movements. Ninety-five per cent. of the persons who come to the Commonwealth, even though they be aliens, will be subjected to no inconvenience beyond that of registration. Those who come here merely for business purposes can obtain an exemption which will enable them to travel round Australia, provided that they do not make Australia their permanent abode. When, however, they become permanently domiciled here we think either that they should become Australians by naturalization, or that we should be apprised of their movements in this country. It will thus be seen that in regard to the majority of aliens, registration will be quite a formal matter. There is abundant power under the Bill to grant exemptions from registration where it is clearly proved that an alien who has lived in the Commonwealth has behaved well. There is no desire whatever to harass him. But it is anticipated that under this measure we shall be able to keep something like an accurate record of aliens who live in Australia, and who should become Australians. Clauses 7 and 8 deal with the manner of effecting registration. The former provides—

An alien resident in the Commonwealth shall effect his registration by properly completing a notice (in triplicate) in accordance with the prescribed form, and by attending in person with such notices before the aliens registration officer nearest to his usual place of abode.

Aliens who are resident in Australia to-day will not be required to register. They were registered during the period of the war, and will not have to duplicate the work of registration. The measure is intended to apply only to aliens entering the Commonwealth for the first time.

Senator GUTHRIE. — Will there be a Committee appointed to deal with them in each State?

Senator RUSSELL.—No. The work of registration will be done chiefly by Customs officers or by State police, though, of course, it must come before an

aliens registration officer. The measure is a very simple one. There may be one or two debatable clauses in it, but it is chiefly a Bill for consideration in Committee.

Debate (on motion by Senator GARDINER) adjourned.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed):

Clause 3—

Section 3 of the principal Act is amended—

(b) by inserting after paragraph (gc) the following paragraphs:—

“(gd) any anarchist or person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth or of any State or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law, or who is opposed to organized government, or who advocates the assassination of public officials or who advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization which entertains and teaches any of the doctrines and practices specified in this paragraph;

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [3.22].—It is proposed to alter the existing Act by inserting after paragraph (gc) the following paragraph, among others—

Any anarchist or person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth, or of any State or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law, or who is opposed to organized government, or who advocates the assassination of public officials, or who advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, or who is a member of, or affiliated with, any organization which entertains and teaches any of the doctrines specified in this paragraph.

We have got on very well for a long time without restrictive legislation of this nature, but we have now in office a Government, members of which imagine it to be their duty to inquire not only into the good conduct of people in Australia, and to maintain law and order, but to inquire also into the political opinions of every person who comes to this country. Those who believe in the use of this authority will, no doubt, consider the Bill to

be necessary, but, according to my view, the security of a Government rests upon the liberty enjoyed by its people. Let us consider the person first mentioned in the proposed new paragraph, namely, an anarchist. When I consider all the "ists" there are, I am almost inclined to believe I am an anarchist myself, or at all events I would be if my temperament were as mild as the average educated anarchist, whose belief, I understand, is that the people of every community should be so good as to require no government at all.

Senator PEARCE.—But this refers to the particular brand of anarchist who would kill every person who does not share his belief.

Senator GARDINER.—As I read the Bill the anarchist will be a prohibited immigrant, just because he is an anarchist. And so also will every other person who advocates the overthrow of the government of any other country. It may be necessary, at times, to deal drastically with certain classes in our own community; those persons, for instance, who favour the overthrow of the Commonwealth or State Governments; but in view of the fact that more than a half of our population is under Labour Governments in the States, I might well be anxious that any persons in favour of overturning those Governments should be excluded.

Senator RUSSELL.—But the people in this country have very effective bullets.

Senator GARDINER.—I know they have, and I remind honorable senators opposite of the developments in Queensland during the past eighteen months. It looks very much as if organized force is being employed there to overthrow the State Labour Government, and it is possible that, if this Bill is passed, we shall place in the hands of the Queensland Government a weapon which may be employed in a manner little dreamed of by those who are supporting the measure. On more than one occasion of late there has been a demonstration in force against the Government of that State. But the point I wish to make is that even if drastic legislation is necessary to deal with any one who interferes with the established government of this country, surely we are not setting up as the protector of other nations, by declaring that any person who believes in

the overthrow of the established government of any country shall be deported from Australia? That is my interpretation of the clause. What on earth have we to do with the opinions of any people concerning the systems of government of other countries?

Senator GUTHRIE.—Then, why did you pass the Home Rule resolution?

Senator GARDINER.—This Bill may be intended for Home Rulers particularly, in order to get rid of them; but I remind honorable senators opposite that the idea of self-determination for all nations is growing, and nothing that is done by this Parliament will prevent Home Rule for an independent Ireland.

Senator RUSSELL.—There is nothing in this Bill to prevent persons who believe in Home Rule from entering the Commonwealth.

Senator GARDINER.—But the Government will have power to deport them.

Senator RUSSELL.—What for?

Senator GARDINER.—If they believe in the overturning of the Government of any other country.

Senator RUSSELL.—If they advocate the overthrow of a Government by force.

Senator GARDINER.—They may be deported if they are opposed to any government, even if they took action against the organized government that was responsible for the butchering of the Armenians. In fact, this Bill is merely an attempt on the part of the Government, accustomed to power vested in them under the War Precautions Act, to use force contrary to our conception of law.

Senator RUSSELL.—The people you have mentioned just now, the Turks, are debarred from entering Australia for other reasons.

Senator GARDINER.—And under this Bill the Government are seeking power to remove those who may be in the country. If, for more than one hundred years, we have got along so well without restrictive legislation of this kind, why should the Commonwealth Government now set itself up as a schoolmaster to inquire into the opinions of all the people who may come here? We have succeeded admirably with less restrictions than in any other country in the world in developing a Democracy that has become law-abiding. I wish our

people were less so. I say that quite candidly. I wish we had, in Australia, a people who, when Governments deliberately use power contrary to law, or who, in the exercise of their powers, strain the law, would deal with them.

Senator GUTHRIE.—Why did you help to pass other restrictive legislation?

Senator GARDINER.—I suppose that, when associated with my honorable friend opposite, I helped to pass many measures upon which he may now have something to say against me; but my reply is that, if during the war I helped to pass any restrictive legislation, its purpose was to protect Australia against its enemies, and for that legislation I take full responsibility. Apart from that, I have one particular objection to restrictive legislation, and whatever attempts may be made in this direction I hope to leave this country with more liberties than I found it. I am strongly opposed to that type of statesman who aims at setting up his standard as the one that shall be followed by the whole community. When I see the Government and their supporters deliberately taking upon themselves the responsibility of restricting citizens and saying how far a man shall go, it is time we raised our voice in strong objection.

Senator GUTHRIE.—Did not the honorable senator assist in imposing a poll tax of £100 on the Chinese?

Senator GARDINER.—As that was imposed many years ago, and before I was in public life, the honorable senator must know that I did not assist in that direction; but if I had done so I would have been proud of it. But there was a particular reason for that, and the tax was not imposed to restrain particular individuals, but was done in a wholesale way to prevent a danger to the whole community by a race which we have long since ceased to refer to as an inferior people. The legislation referred to by Senator Guthrie was passed about forty years ago to prevent an ill-paid people—I shall not refer to them as the members of an inferior race—coming to Australia. If those restrictive measures had not been provided, the employing class of this country would have filled every available position with the cheap labour of other countries. Because of that grave menace to Australia, very wise statesmen in

those days imposed a poll tax to make it unprofitable and difficult to import cheap labour. Their intentions at that time were also supported by a sentimental desire to preserve a White Australia, but this legislation has no distinctive line of that character, but aims, perhaps, at the best feature of our civilization. This legislation has been drafted, not in the interests of the country, but in the interests of those heaven-inspired lawmakers who believe that their particular duties and functions are to restrict the liberties of the people in every possible manner. The Bill provides that the Government shall have the power to deport people who favour overthrowing by force the established government of any civilized country, and I venture to say there are Governments in other countries that ought to be overthrown by force. How pleasing it would have been if force had been employed in Germany before the war, instead of waiting, by a process of evolution, to remove the monarch of that country who was responsible for the terrible slaughter that took place. If there had been a person in Australia who favoured the application of force to overthrow the German Monarch, and this Bill had become law, he would have been deported. The Turk is not finished with yet, and should there be any one in this country particularly interested in destroying the Turkish system of government, he would be presented with a deportation order and removed from the country. I have heard it stated—I am somewhat doubtful in quoting the remarks of others—that when a man is convinced that everything is wrong unless he is there to manage it himself, he will either end his days on a throne or in a lunatic asylum. I do not know in which direction the Minister is leaning.

Senator RUSSELL.—Turkey would not come under the provisions of this Bill, as it is not a civilized country.

Senator GARDINER.—The interjection of the Minister will cause honorable senators to pause before they give this Government additional powers. According to the Minister, the Government can say that any country is not civilized.

Senator RUSSELL.—I was drawing the honorable senator's attention to the fact

that he was gliding away from the modifications the clause provides.

Senator GARDINER.—I am not particularly concerned in the modifications as the measure is a pernicious one, and I wish to deal only with a few generalities. I suppose the Government have already counted the numbers, but I am submitting a few reasons why this clause should not be passed. The Minister is of the opinion that he can read something into the clause that I cannot. It provides—

(*gd*) any anarchist or person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth or of any State or of any other civilized country.

If a person advocated the overthrow of the established government of Turkey, for instance, he could be deported from the Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable senator's time has expired.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [3.39].—I direct the attention of the Vice-President of the Executive Council (Senator Russell) to three words, "any anarchist or," at the beginning of paragraph *gd*, which I think should be deleted, as the clause in its present form is too comprehensive. Supposing, for instance, Prince Kropotkin or Leo Tolstoi were here, they could be deported from the country.

Senator GUTHRIE.—Not because they were here, but if they did something.

Senator SENIOR.—No; it does not mean that if such persons do certain things, but it reads "any anarchist." There are men who in their belief are anarchists, but who differ very widely from the persons described in the latter part of the paragraph, with which I am in full concurrence. I am against the inclusion of the word "anarchist," because it is too all-embracing.

Senator RUSSELL.—You need not waste time; the word is of no value, and I am willing to drop it. Those referred to are included in the following words.

Senator SENIOR.—There are people who may have anarchistic beliefs, but who, otherwise, are reputable citizens. I move—

That the words "anarchist or" be left out.

Amendment agreed to.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [3.43].—I again appeal to the

Committee to read this paragraph carefully before passing it. It runs now:

"Any person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth, or of any State, or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law"—then pay particular attention to this—"or who is opposed to organized government, or who advocates the assassination of public officials." What does "opposed to organized government" mean there? I should like to be in power just prior to an election with such an Act as that on the statute-book.

Senator GUTHRIE.—It means "by force or violence."

Senator GARDINER.—No; the conjunction "or" appears between the two phrases. The two things are not necessary to bring a man within the law. I could imagine the honorable senator being opposed to the government of a very distinguished personage at Rome. If I were in the Government, and wanted to keep the honorable senator out of this country, I could do it by means of this provision, because I could claim that he was opposed to that form of organized government. The sacredness of organized government depends, not on the fact that it is organized, but on whether it is justifying itself. The only thing worth bothering about with regard to protecting Governments is whether they are worth protecting.

Senator GUTHRIE.—It should not be shifted by force or violence.

Senator GARDINER.—Not if it is bad?

Senator GUTHRIE.—Even if it is bad. You have not tried to shift this Government in that way.

Senator GARDINER.—The only thing to justify force is a chance of success, which we have not had yet. At the end of the 18th century a Government in France was removed by force. During the 17th century a Government in Great Britain was removed by force. Quite recently, in Russia, a Government was removed by force, and the whole of the press of Australia, including the Nationalist press, congratulated the revolutionaries. In Germany, recently, a Government was removed by force. The removing of Governments by force is one of the safety-valves of the community.

Senator REID.—Not in a democratic community.

Senator GARDINER.—In any kind of community.

Senator REID.—This country is different from Russia and other countries.

Senator GARDINER.—It is only different so long as power is kept in the hands of the many, and out of the hands of the few. When I see a Government putting out its hands to take what it can catch here, and grasp what it can reach there, and when I see behind it followers who imagine that everything is all right with the world and with us, I say that everything is not all right. There must be an alertness, an energetic intelligence, to maintain the liberties of the world. When I see the door being shut upon people who would come to this country, I must point out that it would shut out any Russian who participated in the overthrow of the Czar's Government, and any supporter of the Czar who now wanted to overthrow the present Russian Government. The provision is absurd, unnecessary, and uncalled-for. I do not know why the time of Parliament should be taken up in passing it. How much worse off would we be if it was not passed? Whom will it keep out? Possibly, on some occasion or other, an agitator to whom the press has given some notoriety. The full majesty of the Commonwealth law will come down on that individual, and keep him out of the country. So far as dangerous men are concerned, there can be no danger from those people to a democratic State if it acts intelligently. I was reared as a boy in the belief that where the British flag flew, never a slave could breathe, and that Britain was the land that offered a home to the outcast from the rest of the world. Evidently, those sentiments strike a chord of memory and sympathy in the breast of the case-hardened Senator Reid. Those were the things they fed us on, but the glory of the whole business was that it was part of our make-up. The British people survived all the influence which those outcasts may have brought into their midst. I am one of those sentimentalists who believe that by force alone one can do very little. The cause that rests on force is doomed, whether it is an Australian

democratic Government or the tyrannical Government of another country.

Senator RUSSELL.—That shows the wisdom of the Bill, which is prevention.

Senator GARDINER.—To prevent the advocates of force from coming into this country?

Senator RUSSELL.—Yes.

Senator GARDINER.—I do not know of any one who would do any harm if he came into this country. If the Czar of Russia were not dead, I should not mind giving him a job to-morrow if he came along. This is a country which has scope and room and wealth, not only for two or three right-thinking people, because I take it that that is all the Government want here, but for all the revolutionaries that ever lived, if we had them all here at once. With our bright sunshine, and the ease with which a living can be made here, this place opens up quite a new prospect to men from all countries. I move—

That the words "or who is opposed to organized government" be left out."

We have an organized Government here, and if I went to New Zealand I might under this Bill be prevented from returning to the Commonwealth because I am opposed to that organized Government. They do not want me here, and they would try to keep me out. I am pointing out what might happen under this clause so that honorable senators opposite will not be able to say that they were not informed as to the abuse which might arise under it when, later on, if they pass this kind of legislation, the Senate and the Parliament become the laughing stock of the community. I submit my amendment to make it quite sure that the fact that a man is opposed to an organized Government should not be considered an offence in any person desiring to come to this country.

Senator GUTHRIE.—The Bill does not say "Governments," but "organized government." Let the honorable senator read the clause properly.

Senator GARDINER.—I am discussing a Bill which I am trying to understand, but Senator Guthrie is interjecting concerning a measure about which he knows absolutely nothing. It is proposed by this clause to make a person liable to exclusion from the Commonwealth if he is opposed to the organized government of any country in the world, though it

might be uncivilized government. The words to which I take exception are not only absolutely unnecessary, but will tend to much mischief if they are agreed to. The Government, under their Protectionist policy, are proposing to keep the goods of other countries out of the Commonwealth, but under this Bill they propose also to exclude the people of other countries, so that the Commonwealth may be held by William Morris Hughes and Company and those who agree with them. Any one who is opposed to the present Government is not to be allowed to come into this country.

Senator GUTHRIE.—“Organized government” includes the Opposition.

Senator GARDINER.—Under this clause the Government might prevent the admission of any person into this country simply on the ground that he is opposed to the organized government of any country. I realize that this measure is a heritage of the war. The Government have for some time past been exercising practically all power under the War Precautions Act, and in almost every case have misused its provisions. Finding that their powers under that Act are nearly at an end, they have introduced this Bill under the pretence that it is a measure to keep out undesirable people, but in reality because it is a measure under which they can keep out any one with whom they disagree. With the last two years' experience of the Government, I am not in the least disposed to agree to any provision vesting them with power that is not so clearly worded that any step taken beyond the law will be immediately obvious. I ask honorable senators not to treat my amendment as one submitted by the Opposition. Evidently this Bill was drafted by some one who had a mighty big opinion of himself and a very small opinion of every one else.

Senator GUTHRIE.—That is not fair to a public servant.

Senator GARDINER.—I attack Ministers, who are responsible for the public servants. Senator Guthrie is not fair to Ministers when he says that this Bill is the work of a public servant.

Senator GUTHRIE.—The honorable senator said that it was.

Senator GARDINER.—I said nothing of the kind. I used the expression “some one,” and in that way desired to refer to a member of the Government.

Senator RUSSELL.—The most important recommendations adopted in the Bill were made by senators who were members of the Aliens Committee.

Senator GARDINER.—I should like to know who those senators are. If I were a Minister administering this measure, and they took a trip to New Zealand, I should be tempted to prevent them coming back to the Commonwealth. We may expect that treatment to be served out to those who will persist in passing legislation of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Shannon).—Order! The honorable senator's time has expired.

Senator GARDINER.—I think not, sir. I was speaking to clause 3, but I have for some minutes been speaking to my amendment. If you rule that I have exhausted my time since I moved my amendment, perhaps you will inform me at what time I did move it.

The CHAIRMAN.—That makes no difference. The honorable senator has been speaking for fifteen minutes.

Senator GARDINER.—Could I not speak to my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes; the honorable senator may rise again to speak to the amendment.

Senator O'LOGLIN (South Australia) [3.59].—I shall certainly support the amendment. I do not think that the Government can have carefully considered the wording of the clause, or they would see that it is so wide in its present form as to be liable to abuse. It is all very well to tell us that their intentions are good, but the measure will be administered according to the exact wording of its provisions. If we take the case of Russia, we shall find that some two or three years ago an organized Government there was opposed, and the opposition was not only applauded by press and public, but official congratulations of the Allies were sent to the men who opposed that organized Government. Under this Bill the people who were complimented upon their action by the Allies on that occasion would be prevented from entering the Commonwealth. A year or so later soldiers of the Allies, including Australian soldiers, were sent to upset the organized Government which had then been established in Russia.

Senator REID.—It was because there was no Government there that they were sent.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—There was a Government established by the will of the people.

Senator GUTHRIE.—Not by the will of the people.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—They administered the government of the country most successfully, too. Australian soldiers went to assist the Allies in suppressing the organized Bolshevik Government in Russia, and under the strict reading of this clause those men could be prevented from coming back to Australia. That illustration shows the abuse to which this clause is liable. I do not accuse the Government of intending anything of that sort, but we should be careful in passing a measure of this kind to see that no abuse may arise under it. If any one advocated the substitution of a Republican form of government for the existing form of government, that would be opposing an organized Government.

Senator RUSSELL.—This Bill does not deal with that at all.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—I take the case of the National party in South Africa, consisting of 45 members, and constituting the largest political party returned at the recent elections there. They are opposing the organized government there, and desire to substitute for it an entirely different form of government. I refer honorable senators to the case of Ireland, where four-fifths of the elected representatives, with the people behind them, desire to substitute an entirely different form of government from that at present obtaining in Ireland.

Senator RUSSELL.—They do not oppose organized government; they want it in another form.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—Are the Republican members of the South African Parliament and the members of the Republican party in Ireland to be classed as people opposed to organized government and prohibited under this Bill from entering the Commonwealth.

Senator RUSSELL.—No. But if they wish to oppose organized government by dynamite, yes. If an existing organized government is opposed by the expression of republican views there is no objection, but if it is opposed by the expression of republican views plus the use of dynamite, those concerned in the opposition in that form would come under the prohibition of this clause.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—I am not dealing with the first part of the proposed new paragraph *gd*, but with the latter part of it. The first refers to persons advocating the overthrow of established government by force or violence, but the part of the clause to which I am referring refers merely to a person "who is opposed to organized government."

Senator RUSSELL.—It means opposition to all government, not to any particular form of government.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—It was recently decided in a Court in Victoria that it is not a crime for any one to advocate a republican form of government in Australia or in any other part of the King's Dominions.

Senator RUSSELL.—This Bill would not affect that.

Senator O'LOGHLIN.—I admit that if persons attempted to overthrow a Government by force in order to substitute another for it they would be guilty of treason. I have read the clause carefully and the second part of the paragraph with which we are dealing makes a person liable to exclusion from the Commonwealth merely because he opposes an organized government. If the Minister says that the clause will not apply to such persons he can have no objection to accepting the amendment.

Senator SENIOR.—I should like to move a prior amendment to that submitted by Senator Gardiner.

Senator GARDINER.—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment temporarily.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn
Senator SENIOR (South Australia)
[4.2].—I move—

That the words "who is opposed to" be left out.

If my amendment is agreed to the proposed new paragraph *gd* will read—

Any person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth or of any State or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law, or organized government,

and so on.

Senator GARDINER.—That is a part of my amendment.

Senator SENIOR. — The honorable senator will see that it is a prior amendment, because if I voted against the amendment he submitted I could not subsequently move for the omission of the words I desire to have left out. Mere

opposition is not a crime. That is the point I wish to make. We cannot legislate against something which we may conclude is in a man's mind.

Senator GARDINER.—I ask your ruling, sir, as to whether the amendment is a prior one to that which I have withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Shannon).—I rule that it is. I would point out that if Senator Senior had not submitted his proposal in this form, he could not have moved it at all. Senator Gardiner will have an opportunity of moving his amendment at a later stage.

Senator GARDINER.—Not if the Committee decide that these words shall stand.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is so.

Senator GARDINER.—Then I am to be debarred an opportunity of obtaining a vote upon my proposal merely because I was informed that Senator Senior had a prior amendment, although that amendment commences exactly where my own proposal commenced.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [4.7].

—The general purport of this clause is to prevent the use of force. Senator Gardiner rather astonished me by his declaration that, in Queensland, there is a collection of forces gathering with the object of abolishing the existing Labour Government, there. That is the statement which he deliberately made. Personally, I am strongly opposed to any section of the community—capitalistic or otherwise—bringing force to bear upon Parliament with a view to unfairly influencing its action. Attempts in that direction have been made here upon several occasions—attempts to which, I am sure, no honorable senator is prepared to submit. Senator Gardiner would be one of the first to resent dictation by any outside body, and to tell its members to go to a warm place. But it is not the political opinions of any man to which exception is taken in this measure. An individual is at perfect liberty to advocate a republic in preference to a monarchy, or a limited monarchy in preference to an autocracy. But he cannot say, "Let us kill the b—— King." Under this Bill, opposition to government means the public advocacy of the abolition of all forms of government by means of force. Surely persons who advocate these methods ought

not to be welcomed here. Senator Gardiner would vote for the imposition of a poll-tax upon so-called inferior races for economic reasons, and I would do the same.

Senator O'LOGLIN.—But provision is made for all that the Minister has said in the previous portion of the clause. Why repeat it?

Senator RUSSELL.—I am not seeking to repeat it. I am prepared to welcome to Australia any person who is willing to respect our standards of living, and to assist in maintaining our institutions. New Zealand, America, and, indeed, every advanced country has already adopted similar legislative proposals. Here we have a beautiful continent containing only a small population, and if we do not protect it by some such means as are provided in this Bill, it will become the dumping ground for the undesirables of all the nations of the world. It goes without saying that a measure of this character should be administered with common sense. I do not know of any class of legislation which is not liable to be abused. But no Government will desire to go after a man's scalp unnecessarily. Senator Gardiner stated the other day that, under this measure, George Washington would have been debarred from entering the Commonwealth. I have yet to learn that George Washington was an advocate of the destruction of all forms of government. As a matter of fact, when trouble arose through the British King ordering troops to America, he left his farm for the purpose of defending his country. Nothing in this measure is designed to prevent that sort of conduct. Other cases of a thousand years ago have been quoted. But none of the weapons used against the British Government is as efficacious as is the referendum with adult suffrage. That is the most effective method by which the will of the people can be expressed. It is quite idle to attempt to apply the conditions which obtain in Russia to a country like Australia. Of course, if we run people into a dead end, we shall certainly have an explosion. The class of people who advocate the overthrow of all forms of government, who do not regard the ballot-box as an effective weapon of reform, and who are prepared to drop a bomb into a public Department, are no good to any country, and never will be.

Senator GARDINER.—Why not introduce a Bill to deal with that class of people?

Senator RUSSELL.—This measure will deal with them. I know that some members of the Industrial Workers of the World, who were found guilty after what we may fairly assume was a fair trial in this Commonwealth, were men who were "wanted" in America, and who had been practically dumped here. This Bill is not an attempt to interfere with the liberties of the people. It is designed, rather, to exclude from our midst the off-scourings of nearly every other country, because in the near future they will be unable to enter New Zealand, the United States of America, or Canada. The Commonwealth, therefore, will offer the best field for the accumulation of persons who are obviously undesirable. I admit that, under Acts of Parliament, Governments can practically do anything; but no Government could continue to exist in Australia if it insisted upon twisting our statute law. It is impossible for this country to assimilate men who do not believe in any form of government whatever. We can tolerate advocates of all forms of government—even advocates of Soviet government; but to advocate a particular form of government is a very different thing from saying that because that form of government cannot be obtained peacefully it must be obtained by force—by the use of bombs.

Senator SENIOR.—I am perfectly honest in my amendment. I merely wish to strengthen the Bill.

Senator RUSSELL.—There is a very old saying that "too many cooks spoil the broth." I have only one desire, namely, that the Bill shall accomplish the purpose for which it was drafted. I am prepared to consult the drafting officers, and if there be any weakness in it, to have it remedied. I am not one of those who wept when the Czar's Government was wiped out of existence, though I recognise that it was not the advocates of the use of force who brought about that revolution. It was the result of the wholesale protest of the people who could employ no other weapon. I believe that if the inhabitants of that unhappy country had been able to express themselves through

the ballot-box, they would have voted the Czar and his Government clean out of existence; and that they would have been able to reconstruct their form of government by peaceful means. They have not that weapon ready to their hands, and I am not going to apply the conditions that obtain in Russia to a country like Australia, where the people can do just what they may choose to do without the employment of any force whatever. Of course, I cannot guarantee the manner in which this measure will be administered—it is quite possible that Senator Gardiner himself may have to administer it—but I do say that it contains nothing that is calculated to bring about the abuses which have been described.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [4.24].—The Minister's point in regard to the employment of force is provided for in the early portion of the clause, and we are now considering the admission of any person who is opposed to an organized government.

Senator RUSSELL.—Not "an organized government."

Senator GARDINER.—We are now considering the admission to the Commonwealth of any person who is opposed to organized government—it may be the organized government of Russia or of Italy, or of America. In the course of his remarks, the Minister touched upon my reference a few days ago to George Washington. I have here some of the opinions of Washington. Amongst other things, I find that he says—

I have never had a will of my own—wrote Washington—where a duty was demanded of me.

At a time when our lordly masters in Great Britain will be satisfied with nothing less than the deprivation of American freedom, it seems highly necessary that something should be done to avert the stroke, and maintain the liberty which we have derived from our ancestors.

But the manner of doing it, to answer the purpose effectually, is the point in question.

That no man should scruple, or hesitate a moment, to use arms in defence of so valuable a blessing, on which all the good and evil of life depends, is clearly my opinion. Yet arms, I would beg leave to add, should be the last resource, the *dernier* resort.

I should have mentioned Bonaparte, Cromwell, Pym, Hampden, and many others who have figured prominently in

the history of the world as being responsible for the overturning of organized government by force. Surely it is not contended that they would be undesirables in this country? If I were a Victorian—I am an Australian—I would make a pilgrimage to Ballarat to pay homage at the grave of Peter Lalor, because he dared to stand against constituted authority, and took his life in his hands in so doing. It is extraordinary that in the twentieth century any Government should attempt to exclude as immigrants persons who may hold certain opinions with regard to tyrannies existing in their own country. All that is necessary is already included in the portion of a clause which has been passed. I dislike the whole Bill, because I think it is most objectionable, and I submitted an amendment to place upon the Committee the responsibility for passing the feature of it of which I most strongly disapprove. I remind honorable senators, too, that the British Government commenced the colonization of Australia by sending out a lot of dreadful people. I know we are supposed not to refer to that matter, because it revives unpleasant memories, but under the influence of our sunshine and freedom a very decent race has been established. It is absurd to think that our people will be contaminated by the introduction of any persons who may, for instance, favour the removal of the Bolshevik Government and setting up in its place a Government appointed by the Czar; or if the Czar were in power again, of removing his Ministers and placing the Bolshevik Government in their place. All Governments exist by the will of the people.

Senator RUSSELL.—And Australia is governed by constitutional authority.

Senator GARDINER.—Whether we appreciate it or not, it is a fact that the ballot has not done all we thought it would do. When questions are submitted for the opinion of the people, and when only one side is heard, the people have no opportunity of coming to a just decision. Under the influence of a corrupt press and a corrupt Government, which insure that only one section of the people shall be heard, the conditions are rapidly becoming favorable to the use of force; not the force employed by those enthusiasts who run up against armed authority,

but the force that will remove the evil without personal risks. It is impossible to get that thought out of the minds of the people when restrictive legislation of this nature is introduced. It is not likely that the introduction of the wildest element in the world will corrupt the people of this country. On the contrary, with our undeveloped resources, a wise Government would invite people to come here, instead of passing restrictive legislation to prevent them. One would think that we occupied only a small garden instead of an immense territory, which, as regards its resources, is as yet practically untouched. I am satisfied that if the Vice-President of the Executive Council (Senator Russell) will read the clause again he will see that all that is necessary is already provided for. A man may be kept out of Australia simply because he is opposed to organized government. I do not think the Minister wants to do that, nor can I imagine any one wanting to do it; but if the Act ever goes before a Court of law the judicial decision will be, not upon the intention of Parliament, but upon the wording of the Act itself. Possibly some one may be kept out because he is opposed to the British Government. Let us imagine that a Sinn Feiner, who believes that Governments should rest upon the will of the people concerned, and accordingly is opposed to the British Government, seeking to enter Australia after this Bill becomes law. If the Minister is administering the Act and receives reports from his officers that a well-known Sinn Feiner, who, so far as his own country is concerned, deliberately wishes to overthrow any alien Government in favour of government by the people, he must keep that man out, though the would-be immigrant may be imbued with a patriotism so great that it impels him to suffer exile rather than submit to a form of government abhorrent to him. The Minister says that such a man must be excluded.

Senator RUSSELL.—I say nothing of the sort.

Senator GARDINER.—Well, the Bill declares that he must be kept out. I urge the Minister to read that clause again very carefully, and see if it can bear the construction which he places

upon it. He will realize that it has no relation to the other part of the clause, because it would, otherwise, be connected with "and" instead of "or."

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [4.30].—I think that if the Vice-President of the Executive Council (Senator Russell) will again consider the effect of my amendment he will see that it will strengthen the position, because the clause will then read—

Any person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the established Government of the Commonwealth or of any State or of any other civilized country, or of all forms of law, or organized government, . . .

The retention of the words "who is opposed to" gives some ground for the construction that Senator Gardiner has put upon the clause, and I want to leave those words out.

Senator RUSSELL.—I will submit the clause to the authorities responsible for the draftmanship, in order that the intention may be made perfectly clear.

Question—That the words proposed to be left out be left out (Senator SENIOR's amendment) — put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	3
Noes	12

Majority	9
----------	---

AYES.

Gardiner, A.	Teller: Senior, W.
O'Loughlin, J. V.	

NOES.

Buzacott, R.	Reid, M.
Earle, J.	Rowell, J.
Fairbairn, G.	Russell, E. J.
Foll, H. S.	Shannon, J. W.
Guthrie, R. S.	
Pearce, G. F.	Teller:
Plain, W.	De Largie, H.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negatived.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [4.35].—I move—

That the words "or who is opposed to organized government" be left out.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Senator Shannon).—The Committee have already decided that certain of the words mentioned by the honorable senator shall stand part of the clause. I cannot therefore accept the amendment.

Senator GARDINER.—That is exactly what I said. Mine was a prior amendment.

Question—That the clause, as amended, be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	13
Noes	2

Majority	11
----------	----

AYES.

Buzacott, R.	Reid, M.
de Largie, H.	Rowell, J.
Fairbairn, G.	Russell, E. J.
Foll, H. S.	Senior, W.
Guthrie, R. S.	Shannon, J. W.
Pearce, G. F.	Teller:
Plain, W.	Earle, J.

NOES.

Gardiner, A.	Teller: O'Loughlin, J. V.
--------------	------------------------------

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Clause, as amended, agreed to.
Clauses 4 to 6 agreed to.
Clause 7 consequentially amended, and agreed to.

Clause 8. (Amendment of section 13b.)

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [4.40].—When Parliament was dealing with alien immigration it had not the courage to embody in its legislation what it actually desired, but it took a circuitous course of achieving its ends. I take it that this clause is to extend the period in which an examination can be conducted from two to three years; and I shall be glad if the Minister will explain what the clause actually means.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [4.41].—Section 13b of the principal Act, when amended, will read—

The master of a vessel on which a prohibited immigrant, or a person reasonably supposed to be a prohibited immigrant, is, may, with the necessary assistance, take all reasonable measures to prevent the prohibited immigrant from entering the Commonwealth from the vessel in contravention of this Act.

It simply places the onus on the master of a vessel.

Senator GARDINER.—I am afraid I was referring to another Act.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Senate adjourned at 4.47 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, 28 April, 1920.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson) took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. HUGHES (Bendigo—Prime Minister and Attorney-General) [3.1].—(*By leave*).—In accordance with my intimation of last week, I propose to make a brief statement of the intentions of the Government regarding the business to be transacted by Parliament between now and the arrival in Melbourne of the Prince of Wales. The War Gratuity Bill and the Repatriation Bill have first to be dealt with, and I hope will be disposed of without delay, and there will then follow the motion foreshadowed in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor-General, thanking the members of the Naval and Military Forces for their services during the late war. Other measures to be passed are a Bill to amend the Navigation Act, a Bill to establish a Bureau of Science and Industry, and a Bill to ratify the agreement with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. The Government must also obtain Supply, and we prefer to do this by getting rid of the Estimates for the current year. It is proposed, therefore, to allot a period for their discussion. In this connexion, honorable members are informed that the Acting Treasurer will be in a position to deliver his Budget speech in August next, and that, therefore, although the Estimates for this year are being dealt with at the end of the year, those for next year will be presented in good time. If we cannot get the Estimates for this year passed before the Prince comes, we shall have to bring down a Supply Bill.

In order to get through the business that I have outlined, it will be necessary, I think, for the House to sit on Tuesdays, and I shall therefore move that we meet on Tuesday next at 3 p.m.

As to the length of the adjournment for the Prince's visit, we think that it will be sufficient if Parliament adjourns for the period that the Prince will spend in

Victoria and in New South Wales. We shall endeavour to so arrange business while he is in the other States, and to give such pairs, as will enable the representatives of those States to be absent without interfering with business or disturbing the equilibrium of parties.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.5].—(*By leave*).—A Bill to amend the Navigation Act is an urgent measure, because the Act should be brought into force as soon as possible, in order that our navigation laws may be right up to date. I believe that the Senate passed an amending Bill, which would have done all that was needed, but it did not get through this House. I do not think there is urgency for the Bureau of Science and Industry Bill, a measure which has been brought forward more than once during the last two or three years. I do not know whether it is intended to rush this through before the proposed adjournment. As to the ratification of the agreement with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, I would remark that honorable members on both sides—particularly those of the Labour party—regard with suspicion agreements with oil companies, because of the "cornering" that has been practised by the Standard Oil Company of America, the most notorious Combine in the world, and similar organizations. It may be, however, that the agreement will free us to some extent from the tentacles of that company. But to ask us to rush through all the measures that have been mentioned is to ask us to pass more legislation than we shall have a fair opportunity of discussing. The Prime Minister says that the Budget will be delivered in August; but we know that the discussion of the Estimates will not necessarily follow immediately. It has been the practice of late years to pass the Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill soon after the Budget has been delivered, so that there may be no delay in proceeding with public works, but—especially during the war—we have not had an opportunity to discuss the Treasurer's proposals until a great deal of the money we have been asked to vote has been spent. I shall be very glad if the Acting Treasurer does introduce a new era, and give us an opportunity to discuss the Estimates shortly after the delivery of the Budget.

RECORD OF GUNNER YATES.

COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Acting Minister for Defence) [3.9].—I told the House during a recent debate that further investigation would be made into the record of Gunner Yates. Of course, I realize that it is due to any man who went to the Front that he should have an opportunity of clearing himself, or being cleared, of any imputation upon his services. I realize that a man's record in the great war is very dear to him; at any rate, I know that my record is very dear to me, and if any imputations were made against it I should be one to make a terrible fuss. At all events, I set about devising the best means for having an impartial inquiry into the whole business of Gunner Yates' service. After consultation with the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce), and with the approval of the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), I have decided to have an investigation of this character: the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) to appoint one man from his side of the House, while I appoint a man from the Government side. It had been in my mind to appoint a military man, but, on the suggestion of an honorable member this morning, I thought that, perhaps, it might be more acceptable to honorable members opposite if I appointed a non-military man. My only wish is to afford an opportunity for an impartial inquiry. The two men thus appointed, I suggest, shall mutually agree upon a chairman from outside, who, I insist, shall be a military officer of the rank of major or higher. It is only fair—at all events, it is only proper—that a military man should be chairman of this tribunal. I did not entertain the proposal put forward by some one on the Opposition side that there should be a Select Committee, for that is a cumbersome method, entailing expense in bringing forward witnesses to give evidence. Under the circumstances, I think that a small Committee such as I suggest would fully answer the purpose.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Will the Committee be allowed to call evidence?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The Committee will have access to all the records of the Department—as much access as I can give it.

Mr. MAKIN.—Would not a Judge or a magistrate be better than a military man as chairman?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—No; a military man knows the channels through which to make inquiries, and through which he can obtain all military records. There must be a military man at the head of this Committee.

Dr. MALONEY.—There might be a military man to assist the chairman.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—No; the chairman should be a military man.

Mr. FENTON.—Leave the military out altogether.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I cannot agree to that. I think I am making a fair proposal, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) to accept it as the best that can be done with a view to establishing Gunner Yates' record—to establishing what he has claimed. I do not know whether that claim is right or wrong, but an inquiry should be made by an impartial tribunal, and I think the one I suggest will appeal to honorable members on both sides.

Mr. MAKIN.—Will the tribunal be able to summon Gunner Yates and others connected with the case?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—That will be left to the Committee. Of course, the Committee cannot summon people to give evidence, for that is the business of a Select Committee.

Mr. FENTON.—That means that if a man chooses he may decline to give evidence.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Let the Committee obtain information where and from whom they like, and in this they will have the assistance of the Department and the staff in furnishing the records.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—That is a fair "go"!

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I hope the matter will not be debated, or any question be raised in regard to it, but that the Leader of the Opposition will accept the proposal.

Mr. TUDOR.—You do not expect me to name my man to-day?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—No.

Mr. HUGHES.—The Leader of the Opposition may take his own time.

ARBITRATION COURT.

REMARKS BY MR. JUSTICE HIGGINS.

Mr. HIGGS.—Has the Prime Minister read the remarks of Mr. Justice Higgins, in which the learned Judge stated that the Government were appointing an illegal tribunal, which, in his opinion, would come into conflict with the functions of the Arbitration Court? If the Prime Minister has read those remarks, has he any statement to make regarding the matter?

Mr. HUGHES.—Yes, I did see a report of His Honour's remarks in one of the morning newspapers. I noted with very great regret that His Honour adopted the same tone in yesterday's proceedings that he did in the proceedings last week—a tone which, in my opinion, is quite improper, and would be strongly resented—

Mr. MAHON.—I rise to a point of order. I submit that no reflection can be made on a Judge except on a motion of which due notice has been given.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) is making a reply in answer to a question. I ask the right honorable gentleman to refrain from making personal reflections.

Mr. HUGHES.—I do not mind whether I answer the question or not; but, if I am asked a question, I shall answer it my own way.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Order!

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—The Prime Minister cannot do that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Prime Minister knows that he is perfectly entitled to answer the question, but in doing so he must conform to the rules of the House.

Mr. HUGHES.—What is the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Prime Minister is perfectly entitled to answer the question, but in doing so I ask him to refrain, as far as possible, from reflecting on the Judges of the Courts, whose conduct can only be debated on a specific motion.

Mr. HUGHES.—I am not reflecting on the Judges at all. Are you, sir—the custodian of the rights and privileges of the House—to sit still, while persons reflect on a member of the House, and a member who occupies the position of the head of the Government. Am I not to

be allowed, when answering a question, to at least say something? If that be the case, I will not say anything here, but will say it where I please.

VISIT OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), without notice, whether he is aware that there is a section of the community, well-meaning though hard-hearted, which considers that all frailties are crimes? If so, will the Prime Minister, under the War Precautions Act, stop the press from printing incidents of the Prince of Wales' journey through New Zealand? I mean such incidents as that His Royal Highness has won two bets at a race meeting. I consider that the press and many sycophants are not giving the Prince a chance; and I desire the press to be suppressed—prevented from printing comments on the frailties of the Prince in going to race meetings, dancing with pretty girls, and so forth.

Question not replied to.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE REPORT.

Mr. GREGORY.—I would like to know what are the prospects of the Trade and Customs and Excise report for 1918-19 being laid upon the table within the next couple of months, in order that honorable members may peruse it before the Tariff is brought forward for consideration.

Mr. GREENE.—I will endeavour to see that the report is laid upon the table within the period mentioned.

ADJOURNMENT (Formal).

ANZAC HAND-WEAVING INDUSTRY.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received an intimation from the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) that he desires to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "The necessity of assisting the returned soldiers and sailors in obtaining a full supply of good yarn from the Government or other mills, in order to make the Anzac hand-weaving industry a success."

Five honorable members having risen in their places,

Question proposed.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [3.21].—Honorable members will sympathize with me that we should now be going into the third year since I first took up this matter. They will agree, too, I hope, that if I were to show some heat in stating my case to-day there would be reasonable excuse, seeing that, instead of some ten or twelve men being employed to-day in the Anzac hand-weaving industry—just as there were at the end of 1917—there should now be an infinitely greater number so engaged. My recommendation, which I hope honorable members will support, is that yarn should be supplied to every returned soldier or sailor who is willing to go in for hand-weaving, and that branches of the industry should be opened in every city or large centre of population. I propose to quote copies of letters which have passed between returned men engaged in the industry and the Minister for Repatriation. In New South Wales, those concerned with hand-weaving have always had a square deal and a fair wage; their pensions have never been tampered with. In Victoria they have never had a square deal, and their pensions have been reduced. In Scotland, at present, returned soldiers and sailors are being given a squarer deal than those in Victoria. I will first read a letter forwarded to me on the 25th November, 1917—

I hereby request that you will kindly give audience to a deputation of returned soldiers to-morrow, Monday, the 26th inst., at 10 a.m., at your office in Elizabeth-street. There are twelve of us, all returned soldiers, engaged in the manufacture of hand-woven tweeds under the supervision of the State War Council.

We requested the Repatriation authorities (Senator Millen) to grant us an increase in pay to enable us to combat the high cost of living, and to eventually repatriate us to allow our forming a co-operative concern and start in business on our own account. I have copies of all communications between both parties, which I will put before you. All of our requests have been refused; therefore, the grounds for our complaints. The majority of us are married men.

Honorable members will perceive that the men wanted to make their industry a co-operative concern, such as could be brought about to-day, thanks to the Country party having succeeded with its momentous amendment to the Repatriation Bill in the course of consideration of that measure last Friday. In the letter

to the Minister for Repatriation, which I will now quote, the men employed in hand-weaving remind the Minister of the allowance which they were receiving, and they point out that, if they were in receipt of a war pension, the amount drawable was deducted from their allowance. In New South Wales, the circumstances were different. Fortunately, the men similarly engaged there were under the Red Cross Association. They received an allowance for three months, and then were paid 2s. per yard as the tweed left the loom. The letter to the Minister is as follows:—

We, the undersigned, respectfully beg that the Honorable the Minister for Repatriation will give consideration to our application, particulars of which are set down hereunder.

We are engaged in the manufacture of hand-woven tweed under the supervision of the State War Council, and are in receipt of an allowance at the present time which is as under—

For a single man, £2 2s. per week.

For a married man, £2 12s. per week, with an additional 3s. 6d. per child per week.

If in receipt of a war pension, the amount drawable is deducted from the allowance.

This scheme is self-supporting, and at present employs twelve returned soldiers, and when each was working a hand loom we would approximately turn out 72 yards of cloth per day, which is sold at the present time for an average of 15s. per yard.

We request that the State War Council supply each of us with a loom and pay us at the rate of 2s. per yard for the manufacture instead of the allowance as at present.

The undermentioned is the profit, &c., which the Repatriation Fund would be in receipt of when the twelve looms were at work in accordance with our request:—Cost of manufacture per yard—Wool, per lb., 3s., equals 1 yard; scouring and darning, 6d., equals 1 yard; wasteage, per yard, 1d.; wear and tear, 2d.; weaving, 2s. (the price which we request); cartage, 3d., on wool and material; total cost, 6s., of finished cloth; sales on average, 15s. yard; profit per yard, 9s. on finished cloth. Each man would average 6 yards.

For twelve men, 72 yards daily at 9s. yard, £32 8s. daily profit.

For twelve men, for week of five and a half days, £178 4s. weekly profit.

For twelve men; per annum, £9,266 8s. per annum.

Total expenditure per annum (all expenses), £6,177 12s. per annum.

Annual turnover, £15,444.

We have the demand from two firms alone, which are prepared to take as much of the material as we can turn out.

We also request that on your decision, should it favour our requests, an amount of the profit be placed in a trust fund to finance

us to the extent of £100 per head—in all £1,200—to enable us to proceed with arrangements at an early date to co-operate and commence in the business on our own account.

Trusting you will give your kind consideration to our requests.

Following is the answer from the Department, signed by the Comptroller, Mr. Lockyer, dated 9th November, 1917:—

In response to letter of the 4th inst., addressed to the Minister, and signed by yourself and eleven other returned soldiers engaged in hand weaving, please inform your comrades that inquiries are being made regarding their representations, and you will be informed later on of the result.

Then the men received a further departmental communication, as follows, dated 23rd November, 1917:—

In reply to letter of the 4th inst., signed by yourself and eleven other returned soldiers engaged at the Hand-weaving School at Carlton, I am desired to advise you that after inquiry it is not considered desirable that the present conditions of employment should be altered.

Yours faithfully,

N. C. LOCKYER.

Honorable members will see that these men did all they could in the matter. The Department was made aware of what had happened in New South Wales, where the returned soldiers were treated as men. Since that time, the Victorians engaged in hand-weaving have been fighting for fair play. If their proposition had been accepted, there would have been now employed, instead of some twelve or fifteen men, fully 1,000, who would have been earning at least £5 5s. a week. I have had the pleasure of investigating the Red Cross hand-weaving industry for the manufacture of hand-woven tweeds and homespuns. There is not one man who has worked at the hand looms in Melbourne but who regrets that control was taken from the State War Council. The officials of that council were most considerate and helpful to them, but since the matter has come under the control of the Repatriation Department and Senator Millen, I regret that the position has been quite the reverse. With the Red Cross weaving industry in New South Wales things have been altogether different. I have a letter with me dated 1917, stating that the men in the industry there worked for three months on an allowance, and then went on to piece-work at the rate of 2s. per yard, whether they were proficient or not. In Victoria, every

Dr. Maloney.

man who enters the industry produces something of value from the very first day. There are at present thirty-five men engaged in hand weaving in Sydney, and each is earning £5 5s. a week, and returning good value for his money, payment being based upon 2s. per yard as the cloth leaves the loom. In New South Wales there are experts at hand weaving who could earn £10 10s. per week, but it is held by the governing body that it is better to employ two returned soldiers at £5 5s. per week than one man at £10 10s. per week. In Sydney the men engaged in the industry are supplied with morning tea, a good luncheon, and afternoon tea; and they are not deprived of the paltry little pensions they are receiving. Everything is quite the opposite in Victoria. Here the pensions of the men engaged in hand weaving were taken from them, and the Minister for Repatriation was unkind enough to say that samples of their output were not exhibited in Queen's Hall along with other products of returned soldiers because there were no injured or sick men engaged in hand weaving. Had the Minister gone through the building in which the industry is conducted he would have seen that some of the men were without limbs.

Mr. RILEY.—Who pays for the afternoon tea supplied to the men in Sydney?

Dr. MALONEY.—It is provided by the Red Cross Society there. I only wish that the men in Melbourne were under the Red Cross.

Accompanied by Mr. Prendergast, Leader of the Opposition in the Victorian Legislative Assembly, I interviewed Mr. Lockyer. We went into the matter thoroughly, but the same old argument was used: that although these men might learn the trade, machinery would in a little while wipe it out, and deprive them of a living. Against that statement we have the offer of Messrs. Buckley and Nunn Limited to take every yard of tweed that these men can make for five years at 15s. a yard. I am wearing a suit of clothes made from Anzac tweed three years ago, which has been cleaned five times. Honorable members can see that the hand-woven cloth of the returned soldiers is holding its own against the imported rubbish which has been used to line it. I

must say that Mr. Lockyer was most sympathetic, but I cannot, for the life of me, understand—unless it was the influence of the man at the top—why he did not allow the men in Melbourne to have the same opportunity as the men in Sydney have. He was most courteous, and went into the matter thoroughly, and if we were unable to persuade him, it was the misfortune of Mr. Prendergast and myself. At any rate, we left his presence knowing that we had met a man.

Some honorable members will recall that I exhibited in the House some yarn sent from the Government Woollen Mills to these unfortunate returned soldiers to be made up into tweed. I pointed out that it was worse than shoddy, which, as we all know, is an admixture of cotton and wool. There was no cotton in this yarn, but the wool was of such a short staple that it was absolutely unfit to make up into cloth. I untwisted some of it in the House. It was so short in staple that it would fall to pieces. Accompanied by another honorable member I went to Senator Millen and showed him the yarn, untwisting it in his presence. He said, "This must be stopped." Will honorable members believe me when I say that it was not stopped? I commend the bravery of Sergeant Sinclair, who stood up against the Minister and refused to make up that vile yarn. Where is he now? He has been eliminated, or sacked. Let honorable members call it what they like. But if it had not been for his efforts, there would have been no hand-weaving in Melbourne. Honorable members may recall the noble work that the Melbourne *Age* did in connexion with this matter. Week after week its columns showed up the infamous way in which the industry was being treated. Yet nothing could be done. By and by a little amelioration was granted. The Repatriation Department allowed the men 2s. at the loom; but they wanted the tweed to be measured after being shrunk. Woollen cloth such as this shrinks from one-quarter to one-third of a yard. Yet this wonderful Department wanted the tweed to be measured after it had passed through the shrinking vat. I venture to say that any one who knows anything about weaving will know that the money paid to the

weaver is on the cloth as it leaves the loom. However, that abomination was ultimately got over, and now the men can earn fair wages. The factory was closed for two days as a protest against the manner in which Sergeant Sinclair was treated. There are three gentlemen in Melbourne whose names I could give who are prepared to support the industry if Sergeant Sinclair can do anything for the returned soldiers; but I think he is too disgusted with his treatment. His heart is broken; and he certainly needs a long rest after the fight he has put up. Why is it done? I have with me a piece of the real Blighty tweed, as manufactured at Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. The men who are engaged in making this tweed were earning from £3 to £5 10s. per week at the time I received certain communications with reference to it, but they are now earning up to £7 per week, working eight hours a day. Just to show that there is no truth in the assertion that there will be no call for this hand-woven tweed with machinery competing, let me mention the fact that Burberry, the greatest maker of overcoats in the world, has offered to take this Blighty tweed for ten years at a certain price.

MR. FOWLER.—As a matter of fact, hand-woven tweeds have come in again, and are now holding their own against mill-woven tweeds.

DR. MALONEY.—The Blighty tweed is 27 inches wide; that is three-quarters width. It was purchased at Home at 10s. 11d. per yard, and sold here at £1 per yard. Possibly the freight and duty would amount to 5s. per yard. In Melbourne the Anzac tweed, which certainly looks much better than the Blighty tweed, is sold at 15s. per yard for double width. For a while honorable members and others were permitted to buy suit lengths at 15s. per yard; I was the means of selling over £150 worth of the Anzac tweed at that price, and there is not one man or woman who bought the material but would purchase another length. The Blighty tweed, being of narrow width, is sold to the public in lengths of 7 yards and 8 yards. I showed our Treasurer (Mr. Watt), a keen business man, how the Anzac tweed could be produced at 7s. 6d. per yard, and he asked why could not the public get the cloth at 10s. per

yard. I am still asking the same question. I would submit the following recommendation: After paying good wages, the cloth should be sold as follows:—By the roll at 25 per cent. profit to warehouses and tailors; in suit lengths at 10s. 6d. per yard to the tailors; and at 11s. per yard to the public; all yarn supplied to be of good order and quality.

Thank goodness, the Red Cross in Sydney are independent of the Minister for Repatriation. They have not to beg for Australian yarn to be woven into Australian tweeds by men who fought and bled for us at the Front. Only 500 lbs. weight of yarn is supplied weekly to the Anzac industry in Victoria. If it is impossible to increase that allowance while the output from the Government mill remains, as at present, at 16,000 lbs. per week, let double shifts be worked. I am sure the workmen would be only too glad to work overtime, if necessary, to help their brothers in this industry. I have here two samples of the cloth made by the Department at a cost of 4s. 4d. per yard double width, and it is certainly very good. Unfortunately, in the arrangement made for making this tweed into suits for returned soldiers, no provision was made for quarter and half size suits. Thus, if I desired to obtain a pair of trousers, I should have to select one made for a man 6 ft. high, and have them altered. By making quarter-size and half-size suits, there would be no difficulty in fitting men short and wide like myself. This cloth was supplied to the factories at 4s. 6d. per yard, and tenders were accepted for the making of suits for returned soldiers at prices ranging from 22s. 6d. to 30s. each. Here is an offer that I have received from a reputable firm to supply suits direct to the public if this material were obtainable by them at 4s. 6d. per yard—

13th October, 1919.

To Dr. W. Maloney, M.P.,

Parliament House, Melbourne.

Dear Sir—*Re* our conversation regarding the manufacture of clothing from the Government mill tweed, I am prepared to be able to supply direct to the public, if it were possible to get supplied with the tweed, and the price was as stated, *i.e.*, 4s. 6d. per yard, at the following prices to-day:—Ready-made suits, in four grades.—Grade I., 42s. Grade II., 45s. Grade III., 51s. Grade IV., 60s.

Order suits, in three grades.—Grade I., 60s. Grade II., 69s. Grade III., 82s.

Dr. Maloney.

I can submit, for the benefit of those interested, samples of each of these grades. The output from the factory to-day would be 500 suits weekly, which could be increased as desired. Regarding the distribution of same, I have several suggestions that I would like to submit to you personally, and with my experience, I am sure would prove to be a great benefit to the public.

I am out to help the public who are paying for the war, and who provide the salary of the Governor-General, as well as my own. I thought this was such a good offer, following as it did upon a remark made by the Treasurer (Mr. Watt), "Why cannot the public obtain this tweed at a fair increase?" that I addressed the following letter on the subject to Senator Russell:—

15th October, 1919.

Dear Friend—Enclosed is copy from a reputable firm. I have also other offers. I would be thankful if you can decide, for the benefit of the whole of the public, if the Government mill can and will supply the cloth of equal quality to that lately supplied for the making of suits for our returned soldiers.

If the suits were made from superior cloth, they would be equally reasonable, the difference being the price between 4s. 6d. and that charged for the superior cloth at the mills.

If the government of Australia were placed in the hands of a born organizer like Ford, of motor car fame, with instructions that he should make it a national community, I am sure he would not allow millions of pounds weight of greasy wool to be sent out of the country, as it is at present. When it could be scoured here and made into tweed. I am informed that when Messrs. Foy and Gibson were making cloth for women's costumes at 3s. 6d. per yard, and turning out an article which so to speak "knocked spots" off anything that Flinders Lane had to offer at the same price, pressure was brought to bear—I am speaking subject to correction—and the factory was taken over under a military ordinance to make up cloth for the soldiers.

Tenders were invited by the Government for the distribution of cloth manufactured at the Government Woollen Mills, Geelong, to discharged returned soldiers, and it was stipulated that—

The only persons entitled to order suit lengths under the contract shall be returned soldiers and nurses who were on active service outside Australia, and who were members of the Australian Imperial Force, and were not discharged therefrom for disciplinary reasons.

The Department also invited tenders for the purchase of certain articles, and

among the tenders received was the following:—Caps—forage, khaki, and felt, 5d. each. I believe they cost at the lowest 3s. 9d. each. Curtains, caps, khaki, 2d. each; hats—felt, fur, Imperial pattern, part worn, 2s. 3d. each; helmets—khaki, part worn, 2s. 3d. each; pockets for gas masks, $\frac{1}{2}$ d. each; puggarees—khaki, part worn, $6\frac{1}{2}$ d. each; ribbons for hats, Army Medical Corps, and ribbons for submarine miners' hats, 1d. each; wire for caps, S.D., $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. each. I believe that the Government accepted even lower prices for these articles. The Department also offered for sale short lengths of cloth and flannel, and received among other tenders one in which the following prices were offered:—Cloth, blue, No. 3, 56 inches wide, 10s. per yard; cloth, scarlet, No. 2 and No. 3, 56 inches wide; cloth, white, No. 2, 56 inches wide, and serge, blue, No. 1, 58 inches wide, 10s. per yard; dungaree, blue, $27\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, 1s. 6d. per yard; drab, Melton cloth, thick, 56 inches wide, and cloth, drab mixture, W.P., 56 inches wide, 10s. per yard; flannel, light-weight, 9 ounces, in short lengths, and 8 ounces, in short lengths, 1s. 6d. per yard. I do not know whether this tender was successful, but I hope that the Government obtained slightly better prices.

The question arises as to what it would cost to set up one of our returned soldiers in the Anzac tweed industry. A working loom in 1917 cost £20, and an expert weaver employed in connexion with the Working Men's College advises me that a good hand-power loom can be obtained to-day for £30. From the 1st December last to the 1st April of this year the Anzac Tweed Trust showed a profit of £602, or 27.21 per cent. on the turnover of £2,214. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), in illustrating how the consumer is suffering through the activities of the profiteer, mentioned woollens manufactured in Geelong and sold at a profit by the mills at 12s. a yard. I am informed that the mills supply the warehouses with tweed at from 7s. to 8s. 6d. per yard. A clergyman, who knew what he was talking about, spoke on a public platform in Geelong in regard to this matter. I was accused by Mr. Williamson, chairman of the Chamber of Manufactures, of having made a misstatement, but the assertions made by the reverend gentleman to whom I have referred bore out what I had said. Have not honorable

members heard of tweed manufactured in Geelong at 8s. 6d. per yard sent into the warehouse in Flinders-lane and sold at from 21s. to 25s. per yard?

Extension of time granted.

Mr. BRUCE.—Does the honorable member know of anybody who bought this cloth at 8s. 6d. a yard and sold it at 21s. per yard?

Dr. MALONEY.—No; but if the honorable member cares to go to Geelong I will give him the address of my informant. If he cannot obtain the information then, I shall be prepared to devote half a day to assisting him in further inquiries.

Mr. BRUCE.—I think the honorable member ought to obtain the information.

Dr. MALONEY.—As the honorable member has more means than I have, and is connected with "the Lane" which is being attacked, it is his duty to go to Geelong and make the inquiries.

Mr. BRUCE.—I have inquired everywhere, and I cannot sheet home the charge.

Dr. MALONEY.—I have mentioned my authority, and as he is a relative of Mr. Watt, I would rather believe his statement than the honorable member's hearsay.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The honorable member makes a statement, but he cannot substantiate it. All he can say is that a clergyman said certain things. He does not know those things of his own knowledge. I am in sympathy with the honorable member, but I wish to be fair.

Dr. MALONEY.—Of course, I did not buy the tweed, and if I had bought it I had not the power to send it into a warehouse in Flinders-lane and then sell it to retailers in Geelong at an increased price. Will the honorable member say that every yard of cloth that leaves the Geelong mills and is sent into a warehouse is not sold at a greater profit than 10 per cent.?

Mr. BRUCE.—I also am sympathetic with the honorable member's desire. I have tried to discover these practices, but, like the honorable member, I cannot.

Dr. MALONEY.—I have discovered sufficient to satisfy me. Perhaps the honorable member has taken the trouble to read the report of the proceedings of the Fair Profits Commission last week, when Mr. Henry Allen, a director of Richard Allen and Sons Proprietary Limited, was examined in regard to the

selling of tweeds. I believe Mr. Allen is a member of the City Council, and a very nice gentleman, indeed. He stated that his firm had sold tweeds by competitive tender, and he continued—

We have already done that. The surplus on the goods we offered by competitive tender realized £100 12s. 1d., which amount we handed to the Melbourne Hospital, upon audit of our books by an outside firm.

The Chairman. (Sir J. W. McCay).—Of course, it is your customers' money you handed over, not yours?—It was the difference between the prices received by competitive tender and the prices we offered for the goods.

Some people might call it cheap charity?—I object to that remark.

Did not Mr. Allen state in evidence that he made a profit of 100 per cent? If he did make that profit, he is a profiteer. The Prime Minister said, "I am out against the profiteers every time, and will fight them tooth and claw." I wish to the Lord he would, and I would assist him! On the other hand, the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) said, "I consider the Defence Department is justified in obtaining the highest price for any goods it has for sale." Could any two statements be more diametrically opposed? No one can argue that selling cloth at 17s. per yard, which could be profitably sold at 12s. 6d. per yard, is not profiteering. Without detaining the House further, I ask honorable members to honour the men who fought for our liberties by seeing that those engaged in the Anzac hand-weaving industry get a fair deal. The man who planted the industry in Australia has been dismissed, and the factory was closed up for two days as a protest.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Has not the *Age* exposed all these proceedings?

Dr. MALONEY.—The *Age* has done noble and glorious work in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member's extension of time has expired.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [3.57].—I realize that the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is very earnest in his determination to do everything in his power for the returned soldier, and in that endeavour I am fully in sympathy with him. It is commendable for any honorable member to strive to find means of support for those men who have returned from war service overseas. Unfortunately, there are almost

insuperable difficulties in the way of supplying an unlimited quantity of yarn for the purpose of giving employment to the returned soldiers in the hand-weaving industry.

Mr. STEWART.—Will the Minister state what those difficulties are?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In the first place, the Commonwealth mill is under contract to supply the Anzac Tweed Trust with 500 lbs. of yarn per week for hand-weaving purposes. It has also contracted to supply the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League with 40,000 yards of finished tweed per month, or 480,000 yards per annum, which can be obtained by returned soldiers for civilian suits upon application to the league.

Dr. MALONEY.—Is the mill working more than one shift?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The working of an extra shift has been suggested, and although the difficulties in the way of working a night shift are not insuperable, yet the manager of the mills (Mr. Robinson) contends that, if there is to be any night work, it should be for the purpose of enabling the mill to fulfil its present contracts. The 480,000 yards of tweed which is to be supplied to the league will absorb 70 per cent. of the total output of the mill, leaving only 30 per cent. for the Navy and other Government Departments. It is considered that the mill cannot, as suggested by some honorable members, supply an unlimited quantity of yarn to these men, in order that the hand-weaving industry may assume large proportions. If extra yarn is to be made and supplied to the men now engaged in the industry, it will have to be supplied to others throughout Australia, and it would be impossible for the present Government mill to make enough yarn for the purpose. The mill is being enlarged by the addition of a wing, but even that enlargement will not be more than sufficient to enable it to carry out the contracts to which I have referred.

Mr. FOWLER.—Will not the contract for the supply of 480,000 yards of cloth for returned soldiers and sailors come to an end soon?

Mr. TUDOR.—Some of the men have already got their tweed.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The contract is for a year. I do not know the date of its termination.

Mr. FENTON.—Is there a possibility of yarn being obtained from private mills?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I doubt that private mills would supply yarn to those working in competition with them. The Government is not putting any obstacle in the way of obtaining yarn from private sources.

Mr. FENTON.—If the Government were to make representations to some private mill, surely the supply of a considerable quantity of yarn could be arranged for.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—This so-called hand-made tweed is, I think, rather a worsted; and the contention that hand-made cloth is superior to machine-woven cloth is erroneous.

Dr. MALONEY.—It brings the bigger price.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The honorable member referred to the Burberry material, of which magnificent overcoats are made, but that is hand-woven cloth in which hand-spun yarn is used. Here the hand-woven cloth is made of machine-spun yarn.

Dr. MALONEY.—In "Blighty" to-day they are doing exactly what we are doing here.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I do not think that the hand process produces a superior cloth, except so far as the spinning is concerned.

Dr. MALONEY.—The experts I have consulted are against you.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In March, 1919, the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) summoned a conference of experts, at which a member of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League attended, and the members of the Repatriation Commission were present. After an exhaustive inquiry, a report was drawn up, which embodied a strong recommendation for the discontinuance of the hand-weaving school.

Dr. MALONEY.—Have you read the statements of most of these men, published in the newspapers, to the effect that they did not make such a recommendation?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I have not. I am giving the House now information that has been supplied to me. The conference expressed the view that the hand-loom weaving enterprise should not be further undertaken by the Department of Repatriation, as it could only lead returned soldier operatives to a

dead-end employment. That has been my opinion right along. At the present time, prices are high, and there is a big demand for tweed, and a sentiment in favour of Anzac tweed; but, in time, machine-woven tweed will displace the hand-woven tweed.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—It was said that the machine shears would entirely displace the hand shears, but there are still hundreds of men shearing by hand.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In my opinion, these men should not be encouraged to enter an industry which will go to pieces when times become normal in this country, because they will not be able to compete with machinery. The report to which I have referred says that the sale of the Anzac tweed was contingent largely on two conditions, which would not obtain permanently—

- (a) The present state of the market in suiting cloths.
- (b) The sentiment that the material was "Anzac tweed," a sentiment which, in the opinion of the Commission, was of an evanescent character, and not likely to survive for this purpose for any lengthened period.

Other important factors in determining the recommendation of the Commission which were elicited at the conference were the following:—

(1) None of the seven men engaged at the weaving school was incapacitated, and expert opinion established the fact that a man, in order to pursue hand weaving as a calling, would require to have both his arms and legs unimpaired, and should be otherwise physically sound. From the evidence submitted, there is no doubt that the men engaged at hand weaving could be easily employed in ordinary woollen mill activities.

(2) The hand-loom industry was not a complete self-contained process, but was dependent entirely upon Government mills for its yarn, and was equally dependent upon a private firm for the finishing of the cloth, shrinking, dyeing, pressing, &c.

I am informed that the hand weavers cannot finish their cloth, but must get it finished by machine processes.

Dr. MALONEY.—Messrs. Foy and Gibson have been generous enough, up to the present, to do the finishing, and I believe will continue to do it.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—If hand-loom weaving were being worked all over the Commonwealth, we could not be certain of finding Foy and Gibson's everywhere.

Dr. MALONEY.—Why should not the Department undertake to finish this cloth?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—There is evidence of English authorities of unquestionable standing in the weaving trade in support of the contention—

- (a) That hand-loom weaving is a hundred years behind the times, and cannot be revived against modern machinery; and
- (b) that the work is strenuous and unsuitable for incapacitated men.

Later, upon representations being made with regard to hand-loom weaving by the Fathers Association and the Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League, the Repatriation Commission reconsidered the position of this industry, and reaffirmed its previous decision that the industry was not one that it could recommend the Department to conduct as a repatriation activity.

Extension of time granted.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE. — The gist of the information supplied to me is that for the next twelve months the Government mill will be kept working at its full capacity to meet its contracts, and that if the mill could supply the yarn that is asked for, it would not, in the opinion of experts, be wise to encourage the hand-weaving process.

Dr. MALONEY.—A lot of those statements have been contradicted.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I have not seen the contradictions. Certainly, I think that hand-weaving is an industry which cannot be permanently successful, especially as it is dependent on Government or private mills for a supply of yarn, and produces cloth which is not finished until it has been subjected to processes of power-driven machinery. I am sorry that this is so, because I know that the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is earnest in his desire to improve the lot of the returned men.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [4.14]. —The statements of the Minister are refuted by one of the members of the conference to which he has referred, in a letter published in the *Age* on the 24th April, 1919, addressed to Mr. Gilbert, the Controller of Repatriation. The writer was Mr. A. F. Frood, and he said—

The finding of the Commission relative to the cost of running a two-set spinning plant was evidently *ex parte*, as the proposal to in-

stall a spinning plant was submitted to the Government by me after the Conference.

The last paragraph of the letter is as follows:—

I submit that the facts are against the Commission's findings, and I ask the Minister to give the Committee an opportunity to state their case, or to give the industry a further year's trial on the business lines we have suggested.

There is evidently a difference of opinion as to the erection of the two-set spinning machinery, and we have here a general statement that the findings of the Conference were against the facts submitted. This is very remarkable as coming from a member of the Conference. As to the shortage of yarn, the Assistant Minister for Defence (Sir Granville Ryrie) relies to a considerable extent on the big orders that the Commonwealth Mills at Geelong have to fill, just as though that were the only source of supply. My own opinion is that if an appeal were made to the woollen manufacturers of Australia on behalf of the returned soldiers for the supply of yarn, there would be a handsome response. Although I am an amateur in this industry, I have received some first-hand knowledge regarding it; and it fell to my lot to see the first small model of the hand-weaving machine, which was made by Sergeant Sinclair in his home at Ascot Vale; indeed, Sergeant Sinclair, on that small machine of some 18 inches square, made some cloth. As the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) has said, that gentleman has been sent adrift, or has received some treatment which he does not consider proper. This gentleman is an ex-soldier himself, with a son who fought at the Front, and he is largely responsible for the start of this industry.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is carried on by the Returned Soldiers Association.

Mr. FENTON.—If the returned soldiers do not receive some encouragement from the Government, they will have to drop the industry.

Dr. MALONEY.—It is limited to ten men, and the industry cannot be extended without a proper supply of yarn.

Mr. FENTON.—Without proper encouragement and assistance, such as is given the many other industries in Australia, this one must cease to exist, swamped by importations. If

those who are opposed to the establishment of hand-weaving in Australia know that the Government are not behind the industry, it will have a very short life. It is not a fact that a maimed man, with one hand or one leg, cannot work the machine—that those who take part in the industry must be strong physically. Such maimed men can easily work these machines, and they ought to be given every encouragement. The question is whether it is a proper thing to establish this industry, and allow our returned soldiers to earn a living by its means; and to that question the Government should give its straight answer, "Yes" or "No." It may happen that private individuals in the community will be called upon to financially assist these returned soldiers, and this, of course, would not be to the credit of the Repatriation Department or the Government.

MR. POYNTON.—Where are we to get the yarn?

MR. FENTON.—I suggested just now that the Government might make an appeal to the woollen manufacturers of Australia. I believe that, at the present time, the Commonwealth mills are turning out 480,000 yards of tweed, or sufficient for about 150,000 suits, per annum, and are supplying 500 lbs. of yarn per week to the Anzac Trust.

MR. POYNTON.—That employs seven men.

MR. FENTON.—But we are not going to stop at the employment of seven men. Additions are to be made to the woollen mills at Geelong for the purpose of supplying the increased demand, though I do not say that that includes the Anzac demands. In Victoria there are five or six private woollen mills, and if we take the total number in Australia at a dozen, I feel confident that an appeal to the proprietors for the supply of a certain percentage of the yarn for the Anzac industry would meet with a favorable response. I ask the Minister to consider favorably that suggestion. We may take it that before twelve months have expired there may be another half-a-dozen privately-owned mills in existence. In Victoria and other States companies are being formed for the manufacture of tweeds and blankets; and it is undoubted that as the greatest wool-producing country in the world, we ought to manu-

facture all our own woollens. This is an industry specially fitted for maimed or physically weak men, and it ought to be given a fair trial.

MR. FOWLER (Perth) [4.26].—The honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) deserves a good deal of credit, if I may be allowed to say so, for the way in which he has fought for this industry. Having carefully watched the discussion of this matter, I am bound to express the opinion that there has been a good deal of misapprehension, and a good deal of prejudice; indeed, I am afraid there has been a good deal of downright misrepresentation regarding the possibilities of hand-woven tweed in Australia. I happen to know something about the hand-loom weaving industry in Scotland, and although my actual experience is somewhat out of date, I have kept in touch with those interested in the trade, and feel fairly competent to say a few words regarding it. I desire, at the outset, to flatly contradict those who declare, and who have apparently informed the Assistant Minister for Defence (Sir Granville Ryrie), that there is no chance of hand-woven tweed competing with the machine-made article. The actual facts are exactly the contrary. In Scotland, for many years back, the hand-woven article has not only entered the market against the mill product, but is actually gaining ground. It is only because of the limited output possible that there is not much more of the hand-made article sold. The West Highlands of Scotland have been rehabilitated to a large extent by this industry, which is carried on in a very profitable competition with the old-established woollen mills of England. There is, I believe, at the present time a demand in excess of the supply of these Scottish hand-woven tweeds. A good deal of yarn used is not hand made. As a matter of fact, the hand-spun yarn is quite insufficient to meet the demands of the weavers, and, accordingly, mills have been set to work in many instances to fabricate a yarn which approximates, as nearly as machinery can do it, to the hand-spun article. The success of the woollen tweeds made from this yarn has been so great that the mills are now beginning to put on the market imitations of hand-woven tweeds. Manufacturers even go so far as to adopt special methods by which to imitate

the peculiar peaty smell of the real article, in order that simple-minded folks may be deceived by the sniff. The weaving of the tweeds is a comparatively simple matter. The hand loom is not an intricate or expensive machine, and can be manipulated by a cripple. There is only one treadle required in the case of ordinary tweed made of one uniform yarn. Although I have not seen cases myself, I am quite sure that a man who has lost the forepart of his arm and hand, could have a substitute in an artificial hand to enable him to perform the simple operation that the work requires. A man might require a natural hand to ply the shuttle, but even in that case I am not sure that an attachment could not be supplied to enable a maimed man to do the work. At any rate, it is work that may be quite easily learned, and it is so light that I have seen quite young girls working effectively on the loom. Then there is another quality in connexion with hand-loom weaving—namely, that work can be carried on in a shed adjacent to one's own home. The warp has to be put on a beam by a special machine, but it is a common sight in Scotland to see a weaver shouldering his beam home with the warp wound upon it, which, by a simple operation, can be made ready to transform into cloth. An apparatus of the kind, placed at some central point, would serve men who, by their disabilities, cannot get away from their homes. They could have their work carried to them, and so be able to earn a comfortable living at a light and very satisfactory employment. As far as price is concerned, it is quite possible that hand-woven tweeds could not be turned out at as low a figure as an inferior quality of machine-made material; but, so long as Australian hand-woven tweeds are made of a good quality, and all wool, I feel sure that the industry will be capable of indefinite expansion, for there is something about hand-made cloths which cannot be approached by the machine-made article, and which commends them to any one desiring a suit which is at once *recherché* in appearance and capable of eminently satisfactory wear. The hand-woven tweeds, which the Anzacs are producing, are about as good material as a man can put on his back. It would pay the country well, and be at the same time to the credit of the Government, if they

Mr. Fowler.

established mills to supply to the hand-loom weaver the yarn required for his daily work.

Mr. TUDOR.—In Great Britain there are spinning mills which do nothing else but spin yarn which is sold to other people.

Mr. FOWLER.—I have pointed out that there is such a demand for yarn for hand looms—

Mr. TUDOR.—And for machine looms, too.

Mr. FOWLER.—Quite so; but to meet the demand for yarn for hand looms a special yarn is being spun and supplied, so far as may be possible, to whomever requires it. There is no indication of the hand-loom industry dying out in Scotland. It has been established with success in several parts of Ireland, and seems to be gaining rather than losing ground. If we can give the industry reasonable encouragement in Australia, and enable the operatives to secure yarn for their simple machines, we will not only confer an inestimable advantage upon our soldiers, but achieve something of considerable value to the country as a whole.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [4.34].—The Assistant Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) states that hand-woven woollen goods are 100 years behind the times. That may be admitted; but one of the reasons why they do not want hand-woven materials—and especially Anzac tweeds—placed on the market is that the cost of manufacture exposes the enormous charges made for machine-woven materials.

Mr. STEWART.—Whom do you mean by "they"?

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Government, the Repatriation Department. Returned soldiers engaged in the industry can turn out hand-woven tweeds at their anything but up-to-date establishment for 7s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. a yard. But they are not allowed to sell for anything like that price. Certain parties may avail themselves of the concession price of 15s. a yard; and, by the way, I believe that members of Parliament are included among those favoured individuals. But even that price is as much again as the cost of production; and the public must pay £1 a yard. The fact is that they—and I still mean the Government—will not let the returned soldiers sell their

output at anywhere near the cost of production.

Mr. RILEY.—Are concessions made to warehouses?

Mr. MATHEWS. — Yes; but at one stage the soldiers were compelled to sell to one house only. About the cheapest Australian machine-made woollen material costs 15s. a yard. Yet these hand-woven stuffs can be produced for 8s. to 8s. 6d. a yard. Is there any wonder that efforts should be made to decry the hand-woven material and prevent the industry from expanding? In Australia, while we were manufacturing tweeds, we were not manufacturing yarn to any great extent. Since the stoppage of supplies of yarn from the Old Country a need has arisen for the more considerable manufacture of yarn, and companies have entered upon its production. Yet they cannot keep up with the demand. There are many manufacturers of woollen goods in Australia who are now considerably concerned over the new Tariff. I believe there are about fifty knitting establishments in Victoria alone, and they fear that they will be compelled to close their works because of the extra duty imposed on imported yarn. The yarn manufacturers of Australia cannot supply material, for the reason that they have already made contracts with large mills which are manufacturing their output.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Well, let the soldiers build their own yarn mills.

Mr. MATHEWS. — Exactly; that would hugely overcome the difficulty. There is, as a matter of fact, more work entailed in the production of yarn than in the manufacture of woollen material itself. If the soldiers were to go in for manufacturing yarn also their profits would be enormous. I know that the Government are in a difficulty with respect to securing yarn. The Government mill at Geelong is manufacturing tweeds practically to the limit of its capacity, in order to supply returned soldiers; and this is interfering with the production of khaki. I understand, however, that the turning out of khaki cloth is a matter which need not be pushed on with to a very considerable extent at the present moment. If the mills of Australia each supplied a portion of the yarn necessary to keep the returned soldiers going, it would not

amount to a flea-bite. The progress of those mills would not be in any measure retarded.

Mr. TUDOR.— There are twenty-seven mills in Australia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I understand that that is so. The information supplied by the honorable member for Perth (Mr. Fowler) is quite correct. Hand-woven tweed not only competes with the machine-woven material, but is doing so so successfully that imitation hand-woven material is actually being manufactured. I have a suit of such cloth myself. It would have been wiser to encourage the Anzac hand-weaving industry in the best possible manner from the very start, namely, by promoting the hand-weaving of yarn itself, and so turning out a commodity which would be hand-woven material in every respect.

Mr. STEWART.—Is it too late to put that into effect now?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I do not think so. Two years ago, last February, I introduced a deputation to the Minister for Repatriation, when a comprehensive scheme was placed before him for the manufacture of woollen goods in order to assist in the repatriation of returned soldiers. At that time, at any rate, we could not have been interfering with vested interests, because Australia was not producing one-tenth of the woollen goods used by the population. However, all the satisfaction we received was that it would be impossible to carry out the suggestions of the deputation. It is a pity that matters should be allowed to remain as they are. The price of machine-made material to-day is so high that even if a man had no limbs, and had to turn out his tweed with the aid of artificial hands and feet, backed up by his own teeth, he could manufacture more cheaply than the machine to-day. The whole point is that there is a form of robbery going on. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons why the Anzac industry has been kept back is that its expansion would show the people just how they are being robbed. Many persons, by the way, speak of Anzac hand-woven tweed as the best material produced in the world. Extravagant statements of the kind should not be made, since they can be easily refuted. The material is certainly all wool, and hand-woven, and it is

very good; but to exaggerate its quality is only doing the industry harm.

Mr. KERBY (Ballarat) [443]. — I congratulate the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) upon having introduced this subject, which is one of great moment to returned men, and to Australia as a whole. The balance-sheet issued by the Anzac Trust concerning operations during the past six months shows that the working of hand-loom by returned soldiers under present conditions can be carried on profitably. A profit of 27 per cent. was shown upon the turnover. That is so good that one might say that the men engaged in the industry are almost running a danger of being called before the Fair Prices Commission. The Assistant Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) stressed the fact that the report of the Commission appointed to deal with the matter set forth that the industry led to nowhere, and that it could last only for the matter of a couple of years. Even if that were to be the case, the Government should make every effort to have looms established for the supply of cloth during those two years. Unfortunately, there are in Victoria at present about 3,000 returned men out of employment. Numbers of these could learn hand-weaving in six weeks to two months, and they could fully utilize all the yarn available to them. The Minister stated that the Commonwealth Mills at present were working at full capacity in the production of yarn. Some little time ago, I interviewed the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) on this subject, and suggested that he should inquire whether it was practicable to run a second shift on the spinning machinery at the Government Mill. I have not yet received any satisfaction in the matter, but that my suggestion could be carried out has been proved from another source. In Ballarat there is a mill run by private enterprise, at which the employees are at present working the spinning machinery for sixteen hours a day to provide yarn for eight hours' weaving, and they are now making arrangements to work twenty-four hours a day in order to supply an abundance of yarn. With private enterprise willing to do this, surely the Government, in their desire to assist returned men and provide immediate employment, as well as to cut down the cost of living, could work the Commonwealth Mills three shifts a day for the purpose

of supplying sufficient yarn. The honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton) has said quite correctly that, without Government sympathy, the industry would very soon die out; but while we are obliged to pay high prices for machine-woven tweed, there is a very good opening for hand-weaving. The industry is now employing nothing but returned soldiers, and it is capable of great expansion because there is a big demand for the tweed. In these circumstances, it should receive every encouragement. Several honorable members have been under the impression that it is a calling in which disabled men may be employed, but that has not been the experience of the Anzac Trust. They started out by putting men into the hand-weaving without one leg or one arm, but soon ascertained that men so disabled could not do the work satisfactorily. They are now employing on the hand looms only those who are physically sound.

The honorable member for Perth (Mr. Fowler) gave us some very interesting details about hand-weaving in Scotland. I came across a part of Ireland during my visit over there which, until a few years ago, was a barren waste upon which people were unsuccessfully striving their utmost to reap a very precarious livelihood, but which is now a hive of industry. The people are exceedingly prosperous, because some genius came along to those barren hillsides and commenced the industry of hand-woven linens. Each family has its own loom, and they can weave away to their hearts' content. They do not fight for thirty-six hours a week. The men engaged in our Anzac factory work forty hours per week, and for their labours receive an average return of £5 per week. We may not anticipate that their work will continue to be carried on at the same profit to those engaged in it, but, still, results so far indicate that when people are ready to put forth a good effort the hand looms are exceedingly profitable to those who are working them.

The honorable member for Melbourne Ports (Mr. Mathews) spoke of the cost of the Anzac tweed as being 8s. 6d. per yard, but I think he must have been misinformed, because the factory is paying 8s. 6d. per yard for the labour, and beyond that is obliged to pay 4s. per lb. for yarn. Its costs are some-

where in the vicinity of 11s. or 12s. per yard, in spite of which the output is sold at 15s. per yard, and not, as the honorable member for Melbourne Ports said, £1 per yard. Any member of the public can go to the factory and select his cloth, which will be sent to him through any tailor at 15s. per yard.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I know dozens of persons who have been obliged to go to Messrs. Buckley and Nunn's, and have been called upon to pay 19s. per yard.

Mr. KERBY.—The Anzac Trust deals direct with the public, and not through the warehouse. A report was published stating that the Repatriation Commission was unanimously against the establishment of hand looms, but later on four members of the Commission, Messrs. A. E. Fullard, manager of Poy and Gibson's woollen mills; F. W. Lloyd, of Buckley and Nunn; D. Melvin, formerly general manager of the Ballarat Woollen Mills; and A. F. Frood, secretary of the British Empire Union, dissociated themselves from this finding, stating that the report did not express their opinions. These are four practical men with a knowledge of weaving at their fingers' ends. They are satisfied that if encouragement is given to the industry, it will become permanent and profitable.

The establishment of hand-weaving should prove a very profitable occupation for the surplus labour of country districts during slack periods. For that reason alone, I think the industry should be encouraged in every way. All honorable members are in favour of decentralization as far as possible, and are not anxious to establish huge factories, which will draw people into the cities, and away from country districts. I impress on the Government the advisability of making the fullest inquiries into the possibility of working the spinning machinery at the Government mills for twenty-four hours a day if necessary in order to cope with the demand, and give the biggest supplies of yarn possible, not only for the Anzac Trust in Melbourne, but also for other Trusts that may be started in country centres for the purpose of establishing hand-weaving factories.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.54].—The honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is to be congratulated upon bringing this matter forward, and giving honorable members the opportunity of expressing their views upon it. I cannot

speak with any experience of weaving wool, but I have had experience of working up other animal products, in which the hand can always beat the machine, and turn out a better article at certain stages in the process of manufacture. It may be that we are putting the hands of the clock back in advocating hand work in place of the use of machinery, but it is quite possible that the strain on the spun yarn may not be so great with the hand looms. Any one who has seen machine weaving must recognise that there is considerable strain on the fibre of the spun yarn. I candidly admit that I have not sufficient knowledge to know whether the hand-made or the machine-made article is the better. If those who have the requisite knowledge declare that the machine-made article is the better, we are not entitled to provide a pound of yarn for these men to continue their work; if, on the other hand, a supply of the yarn is of advantage to returned soldiers, it is the duty of the Government to give them a fair deal.

Mr. FLEMING.—Some people prefer hand-woven tweed.

Mr. FOWLER.—It is in a class by itself. There is always a demand for it.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; some people prefer the hand-made article, exactly the same as there is always a demand for the hand-sewn boot. I understand that the spinning machines in the mills are graded to avoid strain on the yarn as it is wound on the bobbins. Any one who has visited a spinning mill, and seen the yarn winding round a bobbin will have noticed that the diameter of the bobbin is about half-an-inch when they start to wind the yarn on it, and gradually increases to about 4 or 5 inches when it is fully wound. We have several mills in Victoria making yarn for hosiery. I am not sure what alterations would be necessary for making yarn for cloth, but there is one thing the Commonwealth Parliament must not neglect, and that is to see that, as far as possible, we make in Australia what can be used in Australia. Instead of sending our wool overseas, and bringing it back again in the shape of underwear, hosiery, jerseys, and cloth, we should see that all the wool which can be used in Australia is made up here. I recognise that there have been difficulties in regard to securing adequate machinery, but now

that many of the factories in the Old Country, which were used for making munitions, have reverted to their pre-war business of manufacturing machinery, I trust that they will soon be filling the Australian orders which have been placed with them for some time past. One feature about the Anzac tweed industry is the possibility of eliminating at least one middleman. If these returned soldiers receive the quantity of yarn they need, not only for present requirements, but also for the future, they will deal direct with the retailers, and, in doing so, will receive the hearty support of every honorable member of the House. The mills are compelled to sell everything they produce through the warehouses, which entails extra handling and extra cost. I would be very loath to place any obstacle in the way of the men who are starting this industry. There are twenty-seven woollen mills working in Australia. Surely they could give some assistance to these men who propose to start for themselves. If hand-woven tweed is preferred by some citizens, they are entitled to get it. I trust that the Government will supply the 500 lbs. of yarn they have already contracted to provide. It may be difficult to work a part of a woollen mill a second shift, and not the whole of it. I regret that further time is not available for the fuller discussion of this subject.

Debate interrupted under standing order 119.

ASSISTANT POST OFFICES.

Dr. EARLE PAGE asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

What is the number of assistant post offices in the Commonwealth that has been called on to make up deficiency in guaranteed revenue during the past financial year?

Mr. LAIRD SMITH (for Mr. WISE).—When the honorable member first gave notice of this question he was asked by letter what he meant by "assistant post offices," and as soon as his reply is received the question will be answered.

TAXATION OF WOOL-GROWERS.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Whether he can make known the conditions under which wool-growers will be liable for income-tax and war-profits taxation in regard to their anticipated half-share of profits accruing from the oversea sales of wool, so that

growers may know if such taxation will be levied as one charge for the year in which the dividend is received, or spread over the years to which such dividend is attributable?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Income tax and war-time profits tax on profits accruing from overseas sales of wool will not be assessed in the year in which such profits are actually received, but will be taxed in the year to which the profits are apportioned by the Central Wool Committee.

AUSTRALIAN-BUILT SHIPS.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Home and Territories, *upon notice*—

What is the average cost per ton deadweight of the steamers of 5,000 tons and over already built in Australia?

Mr. POYNTON.—The shipyard costs of the two ships already constructed at the Williamstown Dockyard, including interest on capital, depreciation, and overhead charges, work out at about £29 per deadweight ton. The cost of the vessels completed at Walsh Island and Cockatoo Island is not yet available.

TANUNDA CLUB.

Mr. GABB asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether he will inform the House by what authority the Government refuses to allow the Tanunda Club to re-open?

2. Whether by keeping such club closed is the Government not annulling the decision of the State Licensing Board in regard thereto?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Under the authority of the War Precautions Act.

2. The State Licensing Board is not concerned with the administration of Commonwealth law.

COMMERCE REGULATION.

COPPER SHEETS AND PLATES—EXPORT OF FOODSTUFFS.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Has provision been made that all copper sheets and plates manufactured in Australia must be made according to the requirements of the British Board of Trade?

2. Has action been taken under the Commerce Act to compel manufacturers to provide full weight in tins or packages of meats, jams, butter, condiments, &c., for export?

3. If not, when will such action be taken?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. It is not usual to make Tariff provision in a matter of this kind. The interests of the public requiring these conditions are invariably conserved in the terms set out in any shipbuilding contract.

2. In the case of meat (other than carcass meat), jams, and butter, the commerce regulations require the application of a label or brand specifying (*inter alia*) the net weight or quantity of the goods. It is not compulsory to apply statements of weight to condiments for export, but any such statements voluntarily applied must be correct. Goods bearing false statements as to weight are prohibited exports, and samples are frequently weighed by officers, in order to test the accuracy of statements of weight. In the case of goods exported for consumption in China, Japan, Philippine Islands, and adjacent islands, Singapore, the Straits Settlements, or other places adjacent thereto, but to the east of the 90th meridian of east longitude, it suffices if the trade description is applied to the outer coverings. The question of excluding dairy products from the scope of this concession is now being considered. The regulations also provide that in the case of tinned goods, if the net contents fall short of any number of pounds by less than half-a-pound, the weight may be described as "under" that number of pounds. The cancellation of this provision is also under consideration.

3. See answer to No. 2.

TARIFF.

HARVESTERS—WIRE NETTING AND GALVANIZED IRON—IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Was it at the request of H. V. McKay and Co. that increased duties have been placed on harvesters?

2. Can the Minister state what was the selling price of McKay's harvester in Buenos Ayres, Argentine, in 1914?

3. What is its selling price in Melbourne today?

4. Do the balance-sheets of their company show that higher duties are essential to enable reasonable profits being won?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No. The increased duty was imposed in pursuance of the national policy of making Australia self-contained in the production of necessary agricultural machinery from Australian raw materials.

2. Price for 1914 not available. In 1913 the price of an 8-ft. Sunshine harvester in the Argentine was £187.

3. £170.

4. See answer to No. 1.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Was it at the request of Lysaght's that a duty has been placed on wire netting, galvanized goods, and the products generally of their works?

2. Do the balance-sheets of this company during the past two years show that higher duties are essential to enable reasonable profits to be won?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No. The duty is proposed because the Government consider it is in the interests of the country that encouragement should be given to the local production of wire netting and other galvanized products from Australian raw material.

2. See reply to No. 1.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Was it at the request of the Broken Hill Proprietary Steel Works that a duty has been placed on iron, steel, and the products generally of their works?

2. What amount has been paid by the Commonwealth as a bonus for the production of iron and steel in Australia?

3. Do the balance-sheets of this company during the past two years show that higher duties are essential to enable reasonable profits to be won?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No. The Inter-State Commission exhaustively investigated the questions of duties on iron and steel, and the majority recommended the imposition of duties. Further consideration was given to the question, and the proposed duties were decided upon in view of the pressing necessity for making Australia self-supporting in this important branch of industry, whose raw material is wholly produced in Australia, and of providing ample opportunities for the employment of the increased population necessary for the development of Australian resources and the defence of the country.

2. During the period 1908-09 to 1916-17, inclusive, £206,421.

3. See answer to No. 1.

EMBARGO ON IMPORTS.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Is the Minister still enforcing regulation 125, gazetted 10th August, 1917, which placed an embargo on the importation of ale, porter, perfumed spirits, biscuits, confectionery, eggs, fur apparel, perfumery, jewellery, motor bodies, &c., unless the consent of the Minister was first obtained?

2. Under what section of the Customs Act was this regulation enacted?

3. In the opinion of the Minister, was this regulation enacted for the protection of Australian industries?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. Yes. It is being maintained in order to place importers who have restricted goods in bond on the same footing as those importers who have not. It will be withdrawn on the 19th May next, *i.e.*, eight weeks after the introduction of the Tariff.

2. Under section 52G of the Customs Act, 1901-1916.

3. The primary object of the proclamation was to discourage the importation of unnecessary goods, and thus conserve shipping space for more essential cargo. As the result, however, of such restriction and of conditions brought about by the war, local production greatly increased, and it was found essential to continue such restrictions until the date stated in 1.

MANUFACTURERS' PROFITS.

WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. GREGORY asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Has the Commissioner for Price Fixing, at any time during the past two years, inquired into the profits being made by any manufacturers on a large scale in Australia?

2. If so, with what result?

3. What was the aggregate capital employed by the woollen mills in Australia during 1919?

4. What were the aggregate profits of the woollen manufacturers during 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919?

5. What was the percentage of profit in this industry on the capital employed during the years in question?

6. Has the Commissioner reported on the reputed heavy increase in costs of woollen goods from the manufacturer to the consumer, and has he recommended any method of overcoming such extortions, if they exist?

Mr. GROOM (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. Yes; in connexion with applications for increases in the selling prices of the commodities manufactured.

2. All evidence submitted at these inquiries was heard in camera, and on the distinct understanding that it would be treated as confidential. In view of this and the fact that a declaration of secrecy has been made by the officers administering the War Precautions (Prices) Regulations, the information asked for in this question cannot be supplied.

3, 4 and 5. Information is being obtained.

6. No. The Commonwealth Government is no longer exercising its powers under the War Precautions Act to control prices, and these matters are now under consideration by the various States.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

War Service Homes Act—Land acquired under, at—
Goulburn, New South Wales (3).
Launceston, Tasmania.
Mayfield, New South Wales.

AUSTRALIAN NOTES BILL.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Australian Notes Act, 1910-14.

HIGH COURT PROCEDURE BILL.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the High Court Procedure Act 1915, and for other purposes.

WAR PRECAUTIONS (COAL) REGULATIONS BILL.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act to continue in force for a limited time the War Precautions (Coal) Regulations.

NAVIGATION BILL.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Navigation Act 1912-1919.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY BILL.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act relating to the Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry.

OIL AGREEMENT BILL.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act to ratify an agreement between the Government of the Commonwealth and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company Limited.

PATENTS, TRADE MARKS AND DESIGNS BILL.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act relating to Patents, Trade Marks and Designs.

WAR GRATUITY BILL.

In Committee: Senate's amendments agreed to.

Resolution reported and Report adopted.

MOBILIZATION AND VEHICLE STORES AT SEYMOUR.

REFERENCE TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Minister for Works and Railways) [5.13].—I move—

That in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Public Works Committee Act 1913-14, the following works be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for their report thereon, namely, mobilization and vehicle stores at Seymour, Victoria, with necessary railway connexion, water supply, &c.

This is the formal motion required by the Act to allow of this work being referred to the Committee for the purpose of inquiry and subsequent report to this House. These mobilization and vehicle stores are necessary and urgent. The Commonwealth Government have arranged with the Imperial authorities for equipment and vehicles for five dismounted and two mounted divisions of the Australian Imperial Force to be sent to Australia, where they will be stored and issued as required. For this purpose a considerable storage space will be required. The material is now coming to hand, and the Victorian quota will, it is proposed, be principally located in these stores at Seymour. Similar stores are built or being built at Liverpool, New South Wales, and the New South Wales portion of the equipment will be located there. It is extremely urgent that these buildings shall be completed at the earliest possible date as temporary storage space is available now for only a limited portion of the material.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Will these buildings be temporary?

Mr. GROOM.—No. Seymour is to be the mobilization centre for Victoria, as Liverpool is for New South Wales. The decision to erect these stores at Seymour has been arrived at after very careful consideration by the highest military experts of the Defence Department, and after reviewing and inspecting several other sites. It is intended that the site, which is situated about 1 mile eastward of the railway station at Seymour, shall be connected by a special siding with the Victorian railways, and that the necessary water supply shall be obtained from the existing supply for the town of Seymour. The buildings proposed to be

erected at this stage consist of the following:—

- (a) Two equipment store sheds, each of about 30,000 superficial feet of floor area, with road and railway platforms of about 6,000 feet area;
- (b) five vehicle store sheds, each of 30,000 superficial feet of floor area;
- (c) one cottage, as quarters for a resident caretaker.

The construction proposed for the store sheds is of the simplest description, consisting of hardwood wall and roof framing, covered with corrugated galvanized iron, of types which have been generally adopted for similar structures erected and being erected at Liverpool, New South Wales, and elsewhere. The construction of the proposed cottage is intended to be brick. Based upon values obtaining at this date, the estimated cost of the buildings, including the railway connexion, water supply, excavations, road-making, fencing, &c., is, approximately, £75,000.

Mr. RILEY.—That is a lot of money.

Mr. GROOM.—It is a lot of money, but this is very big equipment.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—What area is provided for that money?

Mr. GROOM.—I do not know the area of the site, but the total floor area of the sheds is 210,000 superficial feet.

Mr. FENTON.—Has the land been already purchased?

Mr. GROOM.—I am not sure, but I will get that information. A location plan of site and disposal of buildings thereon, with working drawings of the proposed buildings, are submitted for reference to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, and arrangements will be made for submission to the Committee, in the form of evidence, of complete details respecting the estimate of cost and other features of the proposal which the Committee may call for.

Mr. RILEY.—What is the value of the material to be stored?

Mr. GROOM.—I have not that information; but I know it is very valuable material, and that there is a very large quantity of it. These are matters which will come under the inquiry of the Works Committee itself.

Mr. GREGORY.—Will it be within the province of the Committee to inquire whether the site is suitable, and to make inquiries as to other sites?

Mr. GROOM.—The decision as to what is a proper site for a mobilization centre

for Victoria is, of necessity, a military question. The Act empowers the Committee to inquire into the expediency of the work, and this reference to the Committee, in accordance with the Act, is as to the expediency of proceeding with the proposed work. I am moving this motion in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—What if the Committee finds that the site is altogether unsuitable?

Mr. GROOM.—The site has been selected by the best experts as being the most convenient centre for mobilization purposes for the State of Victoria.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Will it be necessary to build a railway connexion?

Mr. GROOM.—It is necessary to build a siding from the railway station at Seymour. The proposed site is about a mile east of the station on the same side as the camp, but nearer to the station.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [5.21].—The Works Committee should have power to say whether the site is suitable.

Mr. GREGORY.—So they have. We have held that always.

Mr. TUDOR.—We may take that as the view of the ex-chairman of the Committee.

Mr. RILEY. — In some cases we have had no discretion at all.

Mr. TUDOR.—Then the two ex-chairmen of the Committee disagree. If the honorable member for South Sydney (Mr. Riley), who was chairman for about three years, puts up one case, and the honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory), who was chairman more recently, puts up another, where do we stand who have not been on the Committee? I do not say that the Committee should wander all over the Commonwealth inspecting sites, but on making their investigation into the erection of these buildings at Seymour, Victoria, they should certainly say whether the proposed site is, in their opinion, the best or not. After the war broke out, everything was naturally hurried to an extraordinary degree. Within one short period I believe that 29,000 men enlisted in Victoria. Broadmeadows was overcrowded. Influenza or meningitis broke out, and although probably the best was done in the circumstances in creating the camp at Broadmeadows, it had to be hurriedly

shifted to Seymour, and supplementary camps were started at Bendigo, Castlemaine, Geelong, and a number of other places in Victoria. It should not mean much extra expense for the Committee to ascertain whether the proposed site is the best. It would be a different matter if we owned the land, but the Minister was not sure of this when questioned on the subject. If it is not Government land, we are not bound to go there. It is quite possible that if we decided to go there and had not already acquired the land we might have difficulty in getting it, although I know that the Lands Acquisition Act gives the Commonwealth power to acquire land at the value which existed on a certain date. Seymour may not be the best place for mobilization and equipment stores in Victoria. At one time all the camps in Victoria used to be held at Langwarrin. That was supposed to be the probable battleground if ever Victoria was attacked from the sea. Certainly the battleground will never be Seymour. No enemy will ever come *viâ* that place, wherever else he comes from. He may come *viâ* Queenscliff, Geelong, Langwarrin, or Gippsland, but not *viâ* Seymour. It may be necessary to have a place secure from the enemy.

Mr. PROWSE.—That is where we shall make our first stand.

Mr. TUDOR. — I do not know what will happen if we have to fall back on Seymour.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What about Canberra?

Mr. TUDOR.—I presume there will be similar stores in each State. There is already one at Liverpool, New South Wales.

Mr. BOWDEN. — That is in my electorate.

Mr. TUDOR. — Then the honorable member has been failing in his duty this session in not asking questions about the Liverpool manœuvre area. The two previous members, Mr. Orchard and Mr. Cann, asked about fifty times what was to be done with it. It was the stock question for every honorable member for that electorate.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I got the site settled when I previously represented the electorate.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member must have been very lax in his duty,

judging by the questions asked by his successors.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The site was resumed before I left.

Mr. TUDOR. — The site for these stores may be a military question, but if it is the Committee are very much hampered in everything they inquire into so far as the military are concerned, because if that stand is taken they will have no power to change the site.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—There is nothing to prevent them from saying the site is not suitable.

Mr. TUDOR.—That, of course, would be a negative finding. When the question of erecting stamp and note printing offices at Victoria-parade, Fitzroy, was submitted last year, the thing was all cut and dried, and settled before it was mentioned to the House at all.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Has not the site been selected for practically every work before ever the work was submitted to the Committee? It should not be so.

Mr. TUDOR.—It should not be; and that is why I am entering this protest. I want to give the Committee the greatest possible scope for their inquiry.

Mr. GREGORY.—How can plans and specifications be submitted to the House unless the Department selects the site first?

Mr. TUDOR.—Plans and specifications of the buildings could be submitted without the site being selected.

Mr. GROOM.—In the case of city property, in Sydney, for instance, you have to plan to suit your site.

Mr. TUDOR.—I know that is so in certain cases, but I object to the site being cut and dried, particularly if it is not Government property. If it is known that the Government are going to spend £75,000 in a certain district, we all know what happens.

Mr. GROOM.—Under the provisions of the Lands Acquisition Act, nobody can take advantage of it.

Mr. TUDOR.—And no one has ever been known to take down a Government—I don't think!

Mr. PROWSE.—It would be competent for the Committee to report that the buildings are unnecessary.

Mr. TUDOR.—It would be. In view of the terms of the Peace Treaty, and

the promise of demobilization and disarmament, and the cessation of the building of warships, it will certainly be within the power of the Committee to say whether or not it is advisable to go on with this work at the present time. If we have valuable material, it is far better to have it housed than to leave it in the open in all sorts of weather; but it is often the practice to put under cover a certain amount of material when it is doubtful whether it is worth the expense. I want to see the Committee empowered to make the fullest inquiries; and I want it to be within their competence, if they find the site unsuitable, to say so, and to say that they believe it would be better to put the building somewhere else.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [5.29]. —The question raised by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) should be settled by the House. About three years ago, when the honorable member for South Sydney (Mr. Riley) was Chairman of the Works Committee, this question arose in the House, and I remember that the honorable member then complained that the Committee had no voice in selecting the site. He said they were sent to a site and asked, to a certain extent, to approve of it. If that is so, then the whole system ought to be altered, and the Committee ought to be given the fullest power. As one who practically drafted the first Public Works Committee Bill, and induced the House to accept it, I can say what the deliberate intention of the House was that the Committee should be free to report to Parliament as to the advisability or otherwise, in every respect, of the proposals submitted to it. If it is tied to a particular proposal, without reference to the suitability of the site that has been selected, its usefulness will be considerably reduced. Now that we are making the first reference to a new Committee, the House should, I think, determine whether it is within the province of the Committee to report on the suitability of a chosen site, and, if necessary, recommend some other site, or leave it to the House to say whether another site should be inspected. The honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory) and the honorable member for South Sydney (Mr. Riley), who have been chairmen of the

Committee, seem to take contrary views of its functions in this respect.

Mr. RYAN. — The Minister may be able to tell us what the position of the Committee is.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — The Minister says that in the present case the selection of the site is a military matter.

Mr. GROOM. — I said that the selection was determined by military considerations.

Mr. TUDOR. — If Seymour is a good site for the proposed stores, might not some other place within 10 miles of Seymour be equally good, or better?

Mr. GROOM. — The honorable member seems to think that the Committee should travel all over Victoria to discover whether better sites could not be obtained at Bendigo, Ballarat, or some other place.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — Before this proposal is referred to the Committee, we should know the view of the House on the question that I have raised. I think that in the opinion of the majority of members the Committee's inquiries should be as free as possible, and it should have the power, if it finds a site unsuitable, or thinks that a better site is obtainable, to report to that effect.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER. — So it has.

Mr. GROOM. — If the Committee were of opinion that a proposed work would be too expensive, they could report that they considered it inexpedient to proceed with it, and if they thought the site utterly unsuitable it would be their duty to report accordingly.

Mr. TUDOR. — That would be only a negative report.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — I think that the Committee should have the power to say, not only that a proposal is extravagant, but that a better site could be selected for any proposed work.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER. — The honorable member would not have the Committee select sites?

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — No.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER. — It can do everything but that.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — A gentleman who has been chairman of the Committee says that it has not such power.

Mr. GROOM. — Does the honorable member contend that the Committee should select sites?

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — No; but I do not think that sites should be selected and land purchased before the Committee has reported on a proposal. I understand that in the present case the site has been practically selected.

Mr. GROOM. — That is so.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — Then the Committee is to be asked to report upon plans for a building to be erected on a particular site. Such a reference lessens the powers of the Committee.

Mr. GROOM. — Surely, in a case of this kind, the military should fix on a site before a proposal is submitted to the Committee.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — To my mind, the inquiry of the Committee is largely a waste of time and money, and to some extent a farce, when a site is definitely fixed beforehand.

Mr. GROOM. — Departments must put definite propositions before the Committee.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — One, or two, or more sites could be selected by the authorities and referred to the Committee, together with plans of the proposed work. In this case I understand that certain roads will have to be made and a water supply provided; but there may be localities where that expenditure would not be needed. I should like some expression of opinion from the House on the question I have raised. One, or two, or more sites should be selected, and the Committee should be asked to express its opinion upon them.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER. — And so boost their values.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — Let the Government take an option over them, if necessary. I want the Committee's inquiries to be as untrammelled as possible, and I hope the House will define the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the Committee, because there seems to be a great diversity of opinion regarding them.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [5.38]. — I have pleasure in supporting the reference of the proposed work to the Committee, and I have confidence that the Committee as constituted will make a true and faithful recommendation concerning it. It happens sometimes that the Committee is hampered by the fixing of a site before a proposal has been referred to it. The honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory) will remember that for the auto,

matic telephone exchange in Sydney a site was selected which was surrounded with buildings. The Committee approved of the plans submitted to it, but condemned the site. Its report was never adopted by the House, yet, nevertheless, the Postmaster-General of the day went on with the erection of the building.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Was not the Committee's report submitted to the House?

Mr. RILEY.—Yes; but it was not adopted. So far as this particular reference is concerned, I think that Seymour is too far from Melbourne, and that it would be handier to erect the proposed buildings at Broadmeadows. I wish to know from the Minister whether the Department intends to use new iron, or whether the old iron already in its possession will be utilized?

Mr. GROOM.—That will be a question for the Committee to investigate.

Mr. RILEY.—The expenditure of £75,000 upon the erection of sheds to house certain material is a big proposal. At the present time galvanized iron is very dear. I suggest that the Committee should consider the utilization of the old iron and timber that is now at Liverpool and Broadmeadows.

Mr. GROOM.—It is the practice at the present time to use again whatever material may be available, and suitable.

Mr. GREGORY (Dampier) [5.42].—When a proposal is submitted to the Works Committee, care must be taken that neither the Committee nor the Department concerned is so hampered that there may be undue delay in the carrying out of a public work. The Public Works Committee Act provides that plans, specifications, and estimates must be submitted to Parliament by the Minister before a proposed work can be referred to the Committee. It would be impossible for plans to be prepared for any work, unless the Department responsible for them had fixed upon a site as the best obtainable; but one of the first questions to be asked when a proposal has been referred to the Committee is whether the site that has been adopted is suitable. That inquiry was made on many occasions while the honorable member for South Sydney (Mr. Riley) was chairman of the Committee. When it was pro-

posed to erect a large store in Sydney for the Postal Department, the Committee went all round the city to ascertain what storage accommodation was available, and whether it would meet the purposes of the Department, and render unnecessary the erection of the proposed building. It is the duty of the Committee to report on the question of site; and, having been chairman of the Committee for three years, I say that it is its practice to inquire into the suitability of chosen sites. If the Committee were not satisfied that the site that had been adopted was a good one, they would make special inquiries; and if they could ascertain that there was a better site, they would recommend that site for adoption; or they would recommend that the site which had been selected was unsuitable, and would leave it to Parliament to make another reference to them. I hold that the Committee has the fullest power to do this. But it would not be justified in travelling all over the country to look for sites. Again, the Act requires that the reports of the Committee shall be submitted to Parliament, and that Parliament shall then decide whether the work in question shall be proceeded with. While the present Minister has been in power, that procedure has been followed; but, under an earlier Minister, the reports of the Committee were almost disregarded, and works were proceeded with without the proper parliamentary sanction. I hope that on every future occasion when a report is received from the Committee—and many of the reports have been of great value to the country—it will be submitted to Parliament, and a decision arrived at as to whether the work reported on should be proceeded with.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY (Hume) [5.45].—Judging from the remarks of the two ex-Chairmen of the Public Works Committee, the present is a very opportune time to have the matter of the reference of works to the Committee placed on a proper footing. I am disposed to agree with the honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory) that it is impossible to draw up plans and specifications of a building without something being known of the site on which it is to be erected. Whilst something should be known about the site, I do not think that

the Committee should be limited to the adoption of a particular site. It occurs to me that if the Public Works Committee is to have the final say in this matter, we are starting at the wrong end. The Minister has said that the military authorities should fix the site for the erection of these stores, and yet it is suggested that the Public Works Committee should have the power to upset the whole proposal by reporting that the site selected is not suitable.

Mr. GREGORY.—Yes; that is so.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—While I agree that something must be known of the sites before plans and specifications can be prepared, it appears to me that the mistake which has been made in this matter has been to purchase the site before the proposal is referred to the Committee. If the site has been purchased, and the Public Works Committee eventually decide against it, what position shall we be in, assuming that the Committee is to be the final authority on the matter of the suitability of the site?

Mr. GROOM.—The final authority is Parliament.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I take it that Parliament will be guided by the report of the Public Works Committee. Suppose that Parliament supports a report of the Public Works Committee against the site selected, what position shall we be in if the site has already been purchased?

Mr. FOWLER.—If it has been wisely purchased, we can surely sell it again.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I do not think that this House should indorse that method of doing business. In view of the dissatisfaction expressed in connexion with the scope of inquiries by the Public Works Committee in the past, I am, as a new member of that Committee, particularly anxious to know exactly the powers intrusted to it. The Minister says that, in this case, the site has been purchased by the military authorities; they have decided the buildings to be erected, and their cost; and after all this has been done, the matter is to be referred to the Public Works Committee. It appears to me that the work that has been done should be the work of the Public Works Committee, and not the work of the authorities who have already arrived at certain conclusions. The site should not be finally purchased until the Public Works Committee has an oppor-

tunity of inspecting it, and deciding as to its suitability or otherwise. I ask the Minister for Works and Railways to say whether the site in this case has really been purchased.

Mr. GROOM.—I am getting the information now. I have already told the House that the Defence Department own a large area of land at the place indicated, but whether they own the particular site selected for these stores, I am unable to say.

Mr. TUDOR.—Do they own the land, or only rent it?

Mr. GROOM.—I am unable to say whether they own this particular site.

Mr. TUDOR.—I believe the Defence Department merely rents, and does not own, the sites of camps in Victoria.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—The fact that the Minister does not know whether this particular site has been purchased or not only makes the position worse from my point of view. If the site has not actually been purchased, there is no serious objection to the proposal; but I have a serious objection to referring this matter to the Public Works Committee, and telling the members that they have authority to decide for or against a particular site, when the Minister does not know whether that site has been purchased or not.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [5.50].—This question came up for consideration before on a motion to refer the erection of the proposed Notes Printing Offices to the Public Works Committee. That, I think, is another of our public works in connexion with which the report of the Public Works Committee was not approved by Parliament.

Mr. GROOM.—Unfortunately, that work was not approved by Parliament.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The building was erected without its authority?

Mr. GROOM.—No; a motion after the report of the Public Works Committee was not introduced.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—I do not know what could be said in favour of the urgency of any public work that was not said in favour of the urgency for erecting that building two years ago, and, therefore, after all the hot wind we had then, I am astounded to hear that nothing has been done.

Mr. GROOM.—The hot wind scorched the proposal.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—I am firmly of opinion that questions affecting the defence of the country should be settled by the responsible military authorities, and that civilian interference with them is liable to lead us very far astray. We should always be in a position to place the responsibility for military blunders upon the persons who are intrusted with the defence of the country. The military authorities have decided that camps should be established in certain places, and that stores should be established at these camps, and we should not now ask a committee of civilians to say that this is all wrong, that the camps should be established somewhere else, and the stores should not be erected at the camps at all. If this course is adopted, the responsibility for failure will rest not with those to whom we have a right to look for guidance in such a matter, but with the Committee of civilians who interfere with their plans.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The military have made more blunders than any other Department.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—Though I may admit that, I should not presume that civilians dealing with the same problems would make fewer blunders than have been made by the military authorities. The question of the site for a camp should not be submitted to the Public Works Committee. That has been decided by the military authorities, and the question that now arises is not as to the position of a camp, but as to the position of certain stores. It seems to me that when the military authorities decided where the camp was to be, they very probably also decided that the stores were to be there too, as one cannot conceive of stores of this kind being erected a long way from a camp, because that would involve the carriage of equipment and supplies to the stores, and again from the stores, and it might be several miles to the camp. In my opinion, the question of the site will not arise in this case, as I believe the Public Works Committee would admit that the only possible site for stores is at the camp where the supplies kept in those stores are to be used.

Mr. GREGORY.—Does the honorable member think that if the Committee found the site selected an unsuitable one they would be justified in reporting to that effect?

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—Yes; but how could they find that the site is unsuitable if it is at the camp? If the Committee came to the conclusion that a camp should not have been established at Seymour, they might then report that no store should be erected there; but if a camp has been established at a particular place, it must be economically advantageous that the stores should be erected at the camp.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—Have we a camp at Seymour?

Mr. TUDOR.—No; I do not think there is a single man there.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—In my opinion, it is somewhat farcical to refer military works to the Public Works Committee at all.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [5.55].—I am very glad that this matter has cropped up. In almost the first speech I made in this House I said that the Federal Parliament should adopt the practice of establishing Parliamentary Committees to investigate various matters coming under the control of the Commonwealth. These Committees should make the fullest possible inquiry into the matters submitted to them, but they should not, of course, have the power in any way to interfere with the policy of the Government. They should be given full powers of inquiry, and should be responsible to Parliament for their report. On their report Parliament should decide whether or not to proceed with the proposal submitted to a particular Committee for report. There are many questions which do not actually come before this House which I should like to see submitted to a Finance Committee. The report of such a committee upon many matters would be valuable just as reports from the Public Works Committee are valuable. In this case government officials have selected a particular site, but in my opinion the Public Works Committee should not be compelled to accept the site selected by departmental officers if, on investigation, they are satisfied that a better site might be chosen, or that the site selected is unsuitable for the building proposed to be erected. We have an instance in Sydney of a site chosen by departmental officers, when, I think, Mr. Spence was Postmaster-

General, for the erection of a telephone exchange; but upon investigation by the Public Works Committee it was seen that it would have been a criminal act to establish a telephone exchange on that site, to which there was only a narrow entrance down an alley-way. Hundreds of employees were to be employed in the building, and the most inflammable material was to be stored there; and so the Public Works Committee condemned the proposal at once, because of the unsuitability of the site. I say that any Parliamentary Committee should have ample powers to inquire into every detail of any matter submitted to it outside questions of Government policy. Parliament would never ask a Committee to discuss questions of Government policy, but the fullest inquiry and report in respect of all details of any proposed work should be submitted to Parliament before it sanctions expenditure upon that work. If the Public Works Committee in New South Wales report that a proposed line of railway will not meet the requirements of the people, or that by an alteration of the proposed route of the line public expenditure may be saved, the State Government will not proceed with the construction of the line by the original route proposed. So it should be in connexion with Committees of this Parliament. I hope that ample powers of inquiry will be given them, and that no action will be taken by Parliament until their reports have been received. We may in most cases expect a majority and a minority report from Parliamentary Committees, and Parliament can decide which should be adopted. I look with great favour upon the establishment of these Parliamentary Committees, which, I believe, are capable of doing very useful work in connexion with the government of the country. I only wish I could take the members of the two Committees to the Sydney Post Office, when I think I could open their eyes to the brutality under which the employees there suffer. Then, if inquiries were made into the proposed alterations there, it would be found that one-third of the space on the ground floor will be taken up by the erection of stays on the walls, and pillars to carry a top room, while another one-third is to be occupied with lift space to give people an opportunity, I suppose, for joy rides. All

Mr. West.

such extravagance and waste could be prevented if the Public Works Committee had the necessary powers. That Committee should certainly be authorized to inquire as to the sites as well as to the erection of proposed buildings. At Seymour much trouble has been caused by the flatness of the land, which renders drainage operations difficult. If men are to be accommodated there, we should certainly see that proper sanitation is provided, for, after all, the first duty of the Government is to insure the public health. The duties of both the Public Works Committee and the Public Accounts Committee ought to be clearly defined, though even with their present powers, they could, by the exercise of a little common sense, do much useful work. The delegation of work to Committees has proved a great success in British Parliaments, and there the Committees have full power, apart, of course, from questions of policy for which the Government are, and ought to be, responsible. I do not know much about the immediate work under discussion, but I can say I fought very hard against the erection of the Notes Printing Office in Melbourne. In that case, when I visited the site, before Parliament had any opportunity to consider the matter, I found all the necessary planking and material there for the building of concrete walls. I hope such a thing will not occur again, and that we shall never find the investigations by either of our Committees forestalled. These Committees are very essential bodies, and they should have complete power to point out mistakes made by the Government or Government officials.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [6.5].—The question before the House is whether a certain work shall be referred to the Public Works Committee. I am in favour of the reference, but I am of opinion that the Committee should have power to make all the inquiries necessary to the presentation of a report for the guidance of Parliament.

Mr. RYAN.—The motion says that the inquiries must be "in accordance with the Act."

Mr. BOWDEN.—We have been told by different members of the Committee that there have been various rulings on the question whether sites are included in the investigations. The Minister (Mr.

Groom) was asked whether the Committee will have this power, and he said that the site was a question for the Defence Department. I am astonished to learn that camps have not been established in Victoria, as in New South Wales. If there is not freehold land, as in the case of Liverpool, where I was instrumental in furthering the work on a former occasion—this motion may have the effect of centralizing a camp at Seymour, and it is a question whether it is desirable to abandon the Broadmeadows Camp altogether.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—The Broadmeadows Camp does not belong to us.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I understand that neither of the camps belongs to us.

Mr. GROOM.—There is an area that has been vested in the Commonwealth for camp purposes, but the particular piece of land under consideration, I find, has not been acquired.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Have we an option over it?

Mr. GROOM.—It has not been acquired at all.

Mr. BOWDEN.—If we decide to build on the land, the price will certainly go up.

Mr. GROOM.—We are protected by the Lands Acquisition Act.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Nominally that is so; but, practically, I find that the Commonwealth is very often not protected by that Act. The point is that the spending of this large sum of money might have the effect indirectly of centralizing the camp there. If the Department has determined that the Victorian camp shall be at Seymour, and has already acquired land for that purpose, the question arises whether that land, or some of it, could not be used instead of acquiring other land. All these questions ought to be taken into consideration by the Committee, and an exhaustive report presented to us.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [6.10].—I am glad that this motion has been moved in reference to a Department which, in recent years, has had the duty of expending millions of pounds. As an old member of the Public Works Committee, I think that every member of it at that time came to the conclusion that naval and military works, instead of being exempt, were the very works that

called for investigation, except, of course, works which were expeditiously required in war time.

Mr. GROOM.—Or works involving secret information.

Mr. FENTON.—The Public Works Committee has inquired into very secret works, and I am very pleased, indeed, that it is now to inquire into expenditure under military authority. I quite agree with the idea that the Public Works Committee should inquire into the whole circumstances of public works, including the sites of proposed buildings. As a member of the Committee I voted against the erection of postal stores in Sydney, simply because I disagreed with the site that had been selected, it being of such a character as to require considerable expenditure in order to find foundations. Last year we had a discussion in this House regarding a certain site for the Notes Printing Office, but I do not think the question was settled whether the Committee should have power to inquire as to the site.

Mr. MATHEWS.—It was left an open question.

Mr. GROOM.—An amendment was moved to that effect; but the question of the site was not referred to the Committee, although I was prepared to agree to that course.

Mr. FENTON.—There should be a thorough understanding on the point from the beginning, because the military authorities may make mistakes, as in the past, involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds. We have only to remember the work on some of the Naval Bases, where investigation at the initial stages would have saved much money. Sites are selected, and works quickly arranged for to cost £500,000 or, perhaps, £750,000, by the military authorities. The honorable member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory), also an old member of the Committee, will bear me out when I say that at a certain Naval Base in Victoria mistakes were made, and that, although the Committee were late on the scene, it was able to save a considerable amount. When the naval or the military authorities require any work carried out, they are, apparently, able to obtain unlimited money; and now we are asked to supply £75,000, as usual, in a hurry. A Treaty

of Peace has been drawn up, but this country, at any rate, seems to be more warlike than even it was during the war; and the Department is prepared, again in a hurry, to spend money right and left. The Defence Department certainly needs a watchful eye on the part of both Parliament and the two Committees. I have no opposition to offer to the motion, but we ought to be placed in possession of all the facts relating to this proposed Camp. We heard rumours that the Broadmeadows Camp was to be done away with, but now we are told that that is not so. Later on, we were informed that the Seymour Camp had been acquired. Now we learn that it has not.

Mr. GROOM.—Part of it belongs to the Commonwealth, but I cannot say the precise area. This particular site, however, has not yet been acquired.

Mr. FENTON.—If the Committee discover that this particular site is an unsuitable one, they should recommend that it be turned down and that another site should be substituted for it.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE CANTEENS FUNDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [6.17].—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of the measure is to vest in trustees a sum of money which has accumulated as a surplus from the operations of the canteens conducted in connexion with the Australian Imperial Force. As honorable members are aware, these canteens were run in the various camps throughout Australia, on the transports, in Egypt, Palestine and France, in fact wherever there were Australian troops.

Mr. WEST.—Wherever they wanted a beer.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Unfortunately beer could not always be obtained. I take it that we must give a lot of credit to those who were responsible for inaugurating the system which was employed in running the Australian Imperial Force canteens. These canteens proved of the greatest benefit to the men of all ranks in the field. One gentleman to whom a

great deal of credit is due in this connexion is Mr. Lockyer, of the Inter-State Commission. He it was who inaugurated the system which has been employed so successfully in the running of the canteens. Under this Bill the fund to be created is to be vested in trustees and is to be devoted to the interests of blind or totally incapacitated returned soldiers and of the widows, orphans, and dependants of those who have been killed in the field. It must be definitely understood that disbursements from the fund cannot be taken into consideration in any way by the Repatriation Department.

Mr. TUDOR.—The sums expended under this Bill will be in excess of the assistance granted by that Department?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes; and the amounts must be kept absolutely separate. The moneys expended under this Bill will have no connexion whatever with any grants that may be made by the Repatriation Department. To insure this result it is essential that neither body should know what payments have been made by the other. It is only reasonable to suppose that some honorable members hold similar views upon this measure to those which were expressed in another branch of the Legislature when it was under consideration there. A section of the Senate held that it would be preferable to hand over this money, which amounts to something like £500,000, to the Repatriation Department.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Is that amount exclusive of the gift by the late Sir Samuel McCaughey?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes.

Mr. TUDOR.—Where did the balance of the money come from?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—From the executors of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey. However, I am merely dealing now with the surplus which has accumulated from the operations of the Australian Imperial Force canteens, and which amounts to £500,000. The whole of this money is to be distributed in the way I have indicated. Then the trustees of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey have intimated that if this money is vested in the proposed Trust—the *personnel* of which I shall state presently—they will be prepared to hand over to the Trust an amount of £450,000. We ought, I think, to place on record our appreciation of such a munificent gift by that deceased gentleman.

Mr. GREGORY.—The executors of Sir Samuel McCaughey do not impose any conditions?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I believe that they do. They have intimated that they will not be prepared to hand over this £450,000 to any Government Department.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Would it not be a fair thing to appoint one of the executors to the Trust?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I do not know that they have made any request for representation on the Board. If honorable members adopt the line of argument which was adopted by certain gentlemen in another place, we shall be confronted with the position that the executors of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey will refuse to hand over this money if it is to be dealt with by a Government Department, such as the Repatriation Department. It will be wise, therefore, not to insist upon any alteration in the principles of the Bill.

Mr. WEST.—The trustees have not been very carefully selected. I do not like some of them.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—They have been already selected. One of the trustees is to be the president of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League for the time being. Another member will be Mr. Lockyer, of the Inter-State Commission, who, I believe, is to be the President of the Trust. The other trustees include Mrs. Alfred Deakin, widow of the late Hon. Alfred Deakin, a lady who has taken the greatest interest in our returned soldiers; Major-General Sir C. B. White, whose appointment is a very good one, I think; the Hon. George Swinburne, Mr. Percy Whitton, and Mr. Harold P. Moorehead. The last-named was, I understand, a private in the Australian Imperial Force. I do not know him personally, but I believe that he is a very able man.

Mr. WEST.—Are not all the trustees from one State?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—They are not.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—What member is from any other State?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Major-General White is not a Victorian. He happens to be here in the performance of his military duties, but he is a Queens-

lander. I do not know from what State the president of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League will come.

Mr. PROWSE.—Where is it proposed that the trustees shall sit?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In Melbourne. In my opinion, it is almost necessary that all members of the Trust shall reside in this city. If we give one State outside of Victoria representation upon the Trust we shall be compelled to give every State representation upon it. If that course be adopted it will be quite impossible for the trustees to meet as often as will be necessary in the discharge of their duties. We could not bring a man over from Western Australia and Queensland, for example, every time a meeting was to be held. The representatives of distant States would be obliged to live here.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—What machinery has been devised to deal with Inter-State cases?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I will explain that in good time, but I am now dealing with the necessity for the trustees residing in Victoria.

Mr. TUDOR.—Are the positions on the Trust to be of an honorary character?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes. Of course, the trustees will have to employ a secretary.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is only fair that the fact that the positions are of an honorary nature should be stated.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I say definitely that the positions on the Trust will be of an entirely honorary character. It is not essential that any member of the Central Trust should be resident in any State other than Victoria, because in each State Capital there will be an Advisory Committee.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 8 p.m.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I have stated that Advisory Committees will be established in the capital city of each State. These will be honorary, of course, and the Government are of opinion that there will be no trouble in securing men and women to act upon them.

Mr. WEST.—There is nothing in the Bill dealing with their appointment.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Regulations will be gazetted for the creation of the machinery necessary to carry out the

purposes of this measure. The trustees will sit in Melbourne; then there will be the Advisory Committees in each State capital; and, lastly, there will be all those small voluntary committees which were established in connexion with repatriation. There were many zealous ladies and gentlemen in every part of Australia who heartily and voluntarily took up the work of assisting in repatriating our returned men. Those small committees have been kept alive, and it is intended now to utilize them in connexion with this piece of legislation. They will be asked to report to the State Advisory Committees on all cases in their districts. The State Committees will send to the trustees their recommendations upon those reports, and the trustees, acting thereon, will send to the nearest Savings Banks the amounts of cash decided to be granted to persons in need of relief. In my opinion, it would be absolutely wrong to hand over the surplus money from the canteens to the Repatriation Department, as has been suggested in another place.

MR. RILEY.—What is the amount of money in hand?

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE.—There is the sum of £500,000, being the surplus from the canteens, and then there is to be added to the fund—if the Trust comprises the *personnel* set out in the Bill—an amount of more than £450,000 under the will of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey. Altogether, there will be something like £1,000,000 available. In substantiation of my remarks regarding the inadvisableness of this money being dealt with by any Government Department, I desire to read a letter forwarded by the general secretary of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League to the Prime Minister as long ago as 26th June, 1917. This letter indicates that even then there was some suspicion in the minds of returned soldiers that the canteen moneys might be handed over to the Repatriation Department. Portion of the letter reads thus—

My council understands that profits from canteens are to be utilised by the Repatriation Committee for repatriation purposes. As a consequence I have to ask if a statement of accumulated profits can be furnished to this council.

In reply, the Secretary to the Department of Defence wrote—

It is proposed that the profits, if any, at the end of the war, resulting from the operation

of the Australian Imperial Force Garrison Institutes and Canteens shall be devoted as an additional aid to the blinded and otherwise permanently disabled soldiers, or some other similar special purpose, which it is considered will command the sympathy and approval of the original contributors. It is not contemplated that any such moneys will be transferred to or be absorbed by the Repatriation Fund.

Even in 1917 a virtual pledge was given that this money would not be handed over to the Repatriation Department; and I repeat it would be very unwise to do so.

There is nothing contentious in this measure. The sooner it is passed the sooner will deserving people benefit. A question has been raised regarding the appointment of another lady to the Trust. I received a telegram to-day from Dr. Mary Booth, an estimable and well-known lady who has done a great deal for our returned soldiers. She very strongly urges that another woman be appointed trustee. Australian women folk have done a great deal during the war, and are deserving of every consideration in the matter of the appointment of public bodies to deal with the affairs of returned soldiers, and I think that, as a compliment, a further appointment might be made to the number of trustees under this Bill. I point out, however, that there are hundreds of capable and enthusiastic women who have given very much time during the war to the welfare of widows and orphans, and of blinded and crippled soldiers. Their services will be of inestimable value upon the State Advisory Committees—even more so, in fact, than upon the Trust itself.

MR. TUDOR.—Does the Bill provide for the appointment of the State Committees?

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE.—They will be created by the regulations.

MR. GIBSON.—Who will appoint the State Committees?

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The appointments will be made by the Government by regulation. Probably the trustees will furnish nominations.

MR. JOWETT.—Will recommendations to the State Committees be made by the trustees?

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I can only repeat that these Committees will be created by regulation, and that they will act in an honorary capacity. They will

work in conjunction with some 800 small committees, broadcast throughout Australia, which have been acting in connexion with repatriation. Their *personnel* have shown a keen desire at all times to be of the greatest possible help to our returned men, and their services have been invaluable. Most of these bodies are still carrying on.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—The trustees will have absolute power over the moneys vested in them?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes, within the bounds of this measure, of course. With regard to the amount to be handed over by the executors of the will of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey, it is laid down specifically how it shall be used.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—In this respect the trustees will be simply administering the will?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes. Senator Pearce, in the course of remarks in another place, is reported, in *Hansard* of 15th April (page 1165), as follows:—

As regards the McCaughey bequest of £450,000, which is to be transferred to this Trust, it has been provided that the money shall be allocated as follows:—(a) Pastoral, agricultural, and technical education, £300,000.

We presume that scholarships will be established under that portion of the will. The Minister continues—

That is for the benefit of the children of soldiers; (b) beds and cots in hospitals for wives and children of soldiers, £50,000; (c) subsidies to building funds of Australian Imperial Force units, £50,000; and (d) for other special purposes to be decided by the Executors, £50,000.

I trust honorable members will not view the measure altogether from a party stand-point. I think I can say, on behalf of honorable members on this side—and I hope on the other side of the House also—that our first wish is to create the machinery for disbursing this money in the best possible way.

Mr. RIBEY.—Do you not think that the soldiers ought to be consulted in regard to the trustees?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The president of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League will be one, and I do not think we could do better than that. I trust the measure will have a quick passage, so that those who are en-

titled to the money may receive it without undue delay.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.18].—I agree with the Minister that the Bill should have a speedy passage, but certain details should be discussed. The whole of the £500,000 representing surplus of canteen fund was made out of the soldiers themselves. Speaking generally, the canteens were well conducted, and the articles were sold at least as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than in private establishments in the vicinity of the camps. As this money belongs to the soldiers they are entitled to have some voice in its distribution; but it must not be forgotten that the trustees will be charged with the handling of another £500,000 from another source. The object of the Bill is a very worthy one, and I am glad to know, from the Minister, that any benefits received by disabled soldiers under this measure will be entirely apart from benefits to which they may be entitled through the Repatriation Department, but the operation of this measure must necessarily relieve the Repatriation Department of a certain amount of work and liability. I understand there are from 200 to 250 blinded soldiers. Recently we passed a Bill providing that they shall be housed free for life, only a peppercorn rental of about 1s. a year being charged in order to retain control by the Department of the houses in which they live, and we have also increased their pension allowances up to £4 per week. I believe, however, that the best we can do for those who have been so unfortunate as to lose their sight is to furnish them with facilities for training in some useful occupation, and in this respect excellent opportunities are available at St. Dunstan's, in England. The trustees to be appointed under this Bill might therefore do far worse than send our blinded soldiers over there for training. But some, in addition to being blinded, have lost limbs. I have in mind one about whom I heard at Dandenong one night last year, when I spoke there, of a man who was blinded, had lost one limb, part of another limb, and had his jaw very seriously fractured. It is hardly likely that one so badly knocked about as he was could be trained for any occupation, but many others can, and I think this money might very well be used for that purpose. I merely

throw this out as a suggestion, as it is possible the trustees will take notice of remarks made in this House concerning the duties which it is expected they shall perform.

Mr. FLEMING.—Your proposal might relieve the Repatriation Department of some of its responsibility.

Mr. TUDOR.—It would; but we have not the facilities for training such persons here. The money representing the surplus from canteen funds profits was obtained after charging the soldiers current rates or less for commodities supplied; and I should here like to pay my tribute of praise to Mr. Lockyer, who is to be the chairman of the trustees. When he volunteered for this work he was, I think, an official in the Department over which I was presiding. It is only right that it should be known that he was then due for six months' furlough; but, instead of taking it, he spent the time in organizing the canteens, and I believe he did excellent work. I take no exception to any of the persons named as trustees; but if I were a representative from one of the other States I might have something to say about the Trust being comprised of residents of Victoria. There is no mention in the Bill about State Advisory Committees, which, I take it, will be appointed for every State. There should be some reference to this matter in the Bill, because what honorable members have been objecting to all along has been the centralization of work. I believe, however, that while Melbourne remains the Seat of Government the trustees must necessarily meet here. The Minister referred to the excellent work done during the war by a great many women on behalf of the soldiers; and I think there was room for more than one woman on the Trust, particularly as the trustees will be dealing with widows, widowed mothers, and the dependants of deceased soldiers, and these, of course, will include girls as well as boys, who will be entitled to be trained for some occupation. As the Minister pointed out, £300,000 of the McCaughey bequest is to be set aside for pastoral, agricultural, and technical education of the children of deceased soldiers. At least the same provision should be made for the education and training of dependants who may not care to en-

gage in any of those rural pursuits. Several honorable members accompanied me a few months ago on a visit to the Working Men's College, Melbourne, where we saw a number of nurses who, like so many of our soldiers, were suffering from shell shock, and also some widows and daughters of deceased soldiers, and who are being trained by the Repatriation Department for some useful calling.

Mr. WATKINS.—I notice the trustees are principally Victorians.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; and I said that if I were a representative from one of the other States I would probably complain about the *personnel* of the Trust, because, with the exception of General White, who is a Queenslander, they are Victorians.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—At the outbreak of the war General White was at Victoria Barracks, Melbourne, I know, because I consulted him on the first Sunday.

Mr. JOWETT.—But he is a good Australian.

Mr. TUDOR.—He told me he was a Queenslander. There should be some provision in the Bill for the appointment of State Advisory Committees, and one woman at least should be on each Committee, because in certain circumstances a woman would be able to get at the facts much better than any man could. From time to time, the soldiers have put forward the claim that they are the only persons who should decide how the profits from their canteens should be spent; but the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) has deprived them of that argument by pointing out that what will be done with this money is in addition to what will be done by the Repatriation Department, and that private individuals have contributed to the fund to be administered by the trustees appointed by this Bill. I cannot see how the Repatriation Department will be relieved of any great amount of work by the disposal of this money.

Mr. LISTER.—This fund is intended to supplement the work of the Repatriation Department.

Mr. TUDOR.—We cannot supplement it too much. Due prominence should be given to the fact that the executors of the estate of one of Australia's citizens have contributed £500,000. Little enough was

given by our citizens voluntarily towards the Repatriation Fund. It will be a good thing if contributions to this particular fund can be secured, because there will be opportunity to do splendid work with the money by way of supplementing the work done by the Repatriation Department.

I agree with the telegram received from Dr. Mary Booth advocating the appointment of a second lady to the trustees of this fund. It would not be such a one-sided body if her suggestion were adopted. I know that Mrs. Deakin and the gentlemen who are named in clause 5 have done splendid work in the past, and I believe that they will do it in the future, but it would be an advantage for them to have the advice of at least a second lady from another State besides Victoria. It could not then be said that there was any desire to centralize the administration of the fund in Victoria. There should be some representative of another State among the trustees. No exception can be taken to the trustees whose names are mentioned in the Bill; but they are not the only persons who have done, and can do, work of this kind. No harm would be done by enlarging the body, and I hope the Government will accept an amendment to enable that to be done, and at the same time to provide statutorily for the appointment of State Advisory Committees, each having at least one woman upon it.

Mr. PROWSE (Swan) [8.34].—The Commonwealth Government have been made virtually trustees of this fund, which has been almost equally provided by the profits derived from the canteens—the soldiers' money—and the munificent bequest of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey. The thanks of this House should certainly be extended to that gentleman for the manner in which he distributed the money he made in Australia. The whole responsibility of the Commonwealth lies in the administration of its trusteeship; and under this Bill we are handing it over to further trustees; but I think there ought to be some way out of the difficulty created by making the Trust entirely Victorian. Following on the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor), I suggest that one person from each State should be appointed to the Trust.

Mr. LISTER.—They would not be able to attend.

Mr. PROWSE.—Quite so; but they could when they cared to do so. In administering money like this, co-ordination is highly necessary. The proposed State Committees may have different opinions as to who is deserving of assistance under this bequest, and trustee money; but if each State is entitled to have a representative on the central Trust, there will be greater co-ordination and smoothness in the administration of the Act and the fund.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—That would be all right if we were paying them, but it is another matter when we are not doing so.

Mr. PROWSE.—I notice that no fees are to be paid to the central Trust, or to the subsidiary bodies to be appointed in the various States. That will mean economical administration; but the payment of travelling expenses of the State representatives would be justified. Victoria is not the only State to be considered, yet the only persons named in clause 5 are Victorians, which fact is bound to cause a certain amount of feeling.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Good heavens!

Mr. PROWSE.—There is no "Good heavens!" about it. This fund is to be paid to soldiers' dependants and others mentioned in the measure throughout all the States; and while every kind word can be spoken in favour of those who are named in the Bill, the provision does not go far enough to satisfy the peoples of the States. Under the present arrangement, State Committees can only communicate with the central Trust by letter. If they could communicate in person through having the right to a seat on the central trust, it would do a great deal towards achieving the smooth working of the Statute.

Sir ROBERT BEST (Kooyong) [8.39].—The pivot of the Bill is the provision for dealing with the sum which represents the surplus from the canteens.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The Repatriation Department can deal with that matter.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The Honorary Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) has explained the wisdom of providing for the Repatriation Department having nothing to do with this money.

MR. HECTOR LAMOND.—That is not the contention of the soldiers.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—There has been a degree of soreness on the point; but the Minister has assured us that there has been a strongly-expressed desire that the Repatriation Department should not deal with this fund in any way. Then there is a further provision for transferring by gazettal notice or otherwise any other fund the Governor-General chooses to transfer to the Trust constituted by this Bill for the purpose of having it administered by them. It is under that provision that the munificent contribution from the estate of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey is to be handed over to the Trust. I am not at all clear what authority there is for allocating this bequeathed money in a particular way, as the Minister indicated was to be done. The money when handed over must be administered by the Trust in accordance with the terms of the Bill.

MR. RICHARD FOSTER.—But it will have to be administered in accordance with the terms of the will.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—Of course, but not in accordance with any terms dictated by a Minister. The Trust will be obliged to consult the executors of the McCaughey estate as to the final allocation of the money bequeathed to the fund. It is quite competent for the Governor-General in Council to transfer to the Trust any other money the Government may have at their disposal, whether it be subject to a bequest or otherwise.

It is quite immaterial to me whether the trustees are chosen from any particular State—I would be quite satisfied if they were all chosen from New South Wales or South Australia, or any other State, but it is quite necessary for them all to live in the one State. Otherwise there would not be effective administration. They must meet frequently.

MR. PROWSE.—But three will form a quorum.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—It would be very unsatisfactory if the work of the trustees should be done by a bare quorum.

DR. EARLE PAGE.—Will not the State Advisory Committees have any power?

SIR ROBERT BEST.—I am coming to that point. The solution of the whole difficulty is that the Trust shall be constituted from the residents of one par-

ticular State who can meet frequently for the purpose of dealing with the fund.

MR. PROWSE.—Would the trustees be weakened if their number was added to?

SIR ROBERT BEST.—As I have already pointed out, it would be unsatisfactory to have the fund administered by a bare quorum.

MR. PROWSE.—We could have those mentioned in the Bill, and add others.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—Those who were added would live in distant parts of the Commonwealth, and all their work would have to be done by correspondence. I agree with the honorable member for Yarra (Mr. Tudor) that provision should be made in the Bill for the appointment of Advisory Committees. It is true that there is full power in clause 10 of the Bill to appoint Advisory Committees by regulation. That clause reads—

The Governor-General may make regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribing all matters which are required or permitted to be prescribed, or which are necessary or convenient to be prescribed, for carrying out or giving effect to this Act.

The terms of that clause are very wide, but it would be more satisfactory to the House if we had a definite assurance that the State Advisory Committees were to form a statutory portion of the scheme. The Advisory Committees must serve as a connecting link with the trustees sitting in Melbourne, as it would be impossible for them to deal effectively with, say, Western Australian cases. After the trustees have been in consultation with the Advisory Committee of a State they must necessarily, as far as the funds under their control will permit, accept its recommendations. We should therefore be quite sure that such Committees are to be appointed, and we should also know what powers are to be vested in them. I am glad to have the assurance of the Honorary Minister that the trustees will also have the assistance of Local Committees appointed under the Repatriation Act.

MR. PROWSE.—The Local Committees will advise as to details.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—Somebody must have the responsibility, and if the trustees are to be assisted by State Advisory and Local Committees, they should be in possession of the most reliable information available. Provided the recommendations of the Advisory Committees are consistent with the provisions of the Bill, I do not

think their recommendations can very well be disregarded.

I am sure those persons who are to comprise the Trust in an honorary capacity will be quite prepared to work harmoniously in the interests of the persons who are to benefit. As suggested by the honorable member for Yarra, I, too, think it is desirable that another lady should be appointed to the Trust. There are a number of ladies throughout Australia who have rendered excellent service in connexion with this particular class of work, and I think it would help the trustees very materially if they were to have the assistance of an additional lady member. It is also desirable that at least one or two ladies should be appointed members of each State Advisory Committee, and if this were done we could rest assured that the work would be performed in a highly satisfactory manner.

I presume the Honorary Minister or his officers have consulted the soldiers or their representatives as to the manner in which the fund is to be distributed. Nobody can take any exception to the broad terms of the Bill, which provide that the trustees shall be charged with the duty of receiving and considering applications from widows and orphans, widowed mothers, and other immediate dependants of deceased soldiers, and from seriously disabled soldiers, for assistance and benefit. I feel sure the measure will meet with the general approval of those who are likely to benefit, and doubtless they have been consulted in some way or another.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—They are to have special representation.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Yes; but I am speaking more particularly of a primary consultation as to the disposal of the fund.

It is gratifying to know that the proposed Trust is to have the able assistance of Mr. Lockyer, who has devoted special attention to this particular class of work, and if the trustees accept his advice they cannot go very far wrong. I join with the honorable member for Yarra in appreciatively acknowledging the fine work he has done in the interests of our fighting men, and I compliment the Honorary Minister on having been able to arrange for the appointment of such a suitable Trust. Per-

sonally, I would not have any objection to a Trust comprising persons selected from any other State, and my only desire is that this important work shall be carried out in a thoroughly efficient manner.

Mr. BLAKELEY (Darling) [8.53].—It appears that this measure has been introduced in skeleton form, but I presume the Government or those who are to administer it know what they intend doing. There are many organizations and Government Departments that are at present performing similar work to that to be undertaken by the proposed Trust. Has it been arranged that the Trust shall pay, say, £1 a week to some persons and 10s. a week to others, or is that to be decided by the Advisory Committees? It has been stated, by interjection, that every case will be dealt with on its merits, but I do not think that the distribution of such a huge sum should be undertaken in a haphazard way.

Mr. PROWSE.—The trustees will not know the manner in which the money is to be distributed until they ascertain the number of cases likely to require assistance.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—All that data are available, as the number of widows, orphans, and totally incapacitated soldiers is at present on record. The House should have some information as to the basis on which the trustees are to work and the probable liabilities that have to be met.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The fund is to be distributed in a comparatively short time—that is, £500,000—and it will be disbursed sensibly and fairly on the recommendations of the Advisory Committees.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—If no definite policy is decided upon the administration of the fund will depend largely upon the moods of individuals. In connexion with our repatriation and pensions schemes we have a set basis which cannot be departed from, and I am afraid that this scheme will not be administered satisfactorily in the interests of those who are to benefit.

The proposed Trust is to consist of very estimable persons, all of whom are favorably known and well fitted for undertaking the work, but I consider that the Trust should comprise not more than

two or three members, and each State Advisory Committee not more than four or five members. As the State Committees are to be appointed under regulations, we do not know how many persons are likely to constitute a Committee. It has been said that we are not dealing with public money, and although such is the case, we cannot disregard our responsibilities in the matter. Every one desires that the best possible machinery shall be provided for the effective distribution of the money, but I cannot conceive how the scheme will work satisfactorily unless Committees are to be appointed in all the States, including Victoria.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Such Committees are to be appointed.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—If a large number of persons is appointed to the central Trust and to the Advisory Committees the work will be hampered in many ways.

As regards the McCaughey bequest, it appears that there is some reluctance on the part of the executors to place the fund under the control of any Government Department, and, judging by my experience, Government Departments certainly do exercise a good deal of reluctance in distributing money to persons entitled to it. I do not desire to say anything against the late Sir Samuel McCaughey, but many of the soldiers who will not return were sweated by that gentleman.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—That is a most disgraceful statement to make concerning an honorable gentleman who was most liberal in donating funds for charitable purposes. The honorable member ought to be ashamed to make such a statement.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I am not ashamed. As president of the Australian Workers Union I am in a position to say that no man gave more trouble to us than the late gentleman, and there is no man who has sweated his men more than he did.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—That is not correct.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The Honorary Minister does not know anything about it.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I do.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—You do not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order!

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The members of the Australian Workers Union made his money for him.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Do not talk rubbish.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I would like to take honorable members to the Yanco shearing shed, where I spent an afternoon quite recently. I can quite understand the honorable gentleman leaving great wealth, as his employees were compelled to live in hovels or pigsties that were unfit for human habitation. However, I do not desire to say anything further about that.

Mr. RODGERS.—Was the honorable member there in the capacity of shearer or agitator?

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The honorable member does not know anything about the matter. Ministerial supporters do not understand the question. They do not know the sweating conditions under which the employees of this gentleman worked.

Mr. FLEMING.—I know as much about the matter as does the honorable member.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Honorable members opposite have not had to strike and fight and to camp on the banks of creeks in order to earn just a living wage at the Yanco and other properties in that district.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—It is not fair to introduce a matter of the kind on this Bill.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Certain statements having been made, I wish to put before the House the views of the members of my organization in order that there shall be no misconception as to how this money was made, or how the employees of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey were treated. If the whole of his wealth were to be given back to the returned soldiers or their dependents, it would be merely finding its way to its proper destination.

Mr. PROWSE.—Does not the honorable member think that he made an excellent will for his country?

Mr. BLAKELEY.—He made a good deal of money out of this country, and at the expense of the workers.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order! The whole of this discussion is irregular.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The McCaughey bequest provides that the sum of about £300,000 shall be devoted to training men in agricultural, pastoral, and other technical work. The proposed Trust will not possibly be able to undertake that training. If a Trust of three mem-

bers in New South Wales or Queensland were given control of that phase of the work alone, how could we expect them, acting in an honorary capacity, to give the whole of their time and attention to matters that are already covered by governmental activities? They could not, and I am sure they would not, do it. There is an allocation of about £50,000 for beds and cots in hospitals for the wives and children of members of the Australian Imperial Force, and a like amount to be used for special purposes to be devised or decided upon by the executors. They, I take it, will be the executors of the McCaughey estate, and they will instruct the trustees of the Canteens Fund as to how this money shall be disposed of. That arrangement is not satisfactory. Once we accept that money we undertake certain responsibilities, and I believe that the funds cannot be satisfactorily administered by persons acting honorarily, for the reason that they have neither the knowledge nor the time to deal with highly technical subjects upon which large staffs are employed throughout the Commonwealth. There are the system of vocational training in connexion with the Repatriation Department, and the instruction given by the various State colleges and experimental farms in agriculture, viticulture, horticulture, and many other rural pursuits. It is now proposed that, in addition to those activities, some very estimable people, known perhaps for their patriotic work, shall be given the task of deciding highly technical questions in regard to education. They will be unfit for the work, which will necessarily be delegated to other persons having the necessary knowledge, and who will be paid for their services. In its present form, the Bill is a mere skeleton; evidently very little care has been given to its preparation. So far as the measure goes, it has been explained, but much in connexion with these funds has been left unexplained. The creation of a huge and cumbersome committee of trustees is the only tangible scheme contained in the Bill, together with an all-embracing power to make regulations which will be the real legislation under which the fund will be administered. The Minister would act wisely if he recast the Bill, withdrawing it for that purpose if necessary. In its present form it is bound to cause a

good deal of work in Committee. I shall move to provide for the creation of three head trustees, and Committees of not more than four in each State. The Committees will do the local administration work, and their recommendations will be sent to the three head trustees. If the Government will not accept that amendment a good deal of time will be occupied in discussing the Bill, and there will be divisions and other delays which should not be necessary in connexion with a measure of this character. If the Government will recast the Bill on more definite lines, and give more information to the House, the measure will be passed much easier than it is likely to be in its present form.

Mr. FLEMING (Robertson) [9.5].—It is regrettable that we should have had to listen to a speech such as that which has just been delivered. The late Sir Samuel McCaughey made his wealth by increasing the production of Australia through improving what is, after all, the chief industry of this country. To no man in the history of the Commonwealth do we owe more for the improvement of our flocks than we do to the deceased gentleman, whose memory has been attacked this evening. Any man who improves the flocks and herds of the country takes no money out of anybody's pocket, but puts money into the pockets of the whole community.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—He improved not only the flocks, but also the country.

Mr. FLEMING.—Just so; and he added to the wealth of the community without defrauding anybody. Yet we were told by the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley), who is president of the Australian Workers Union, that the late gentleman made his money by robbing the workers.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Yes, by sweating them.

Mr. FLEMING.—I know the workers in the bush just as well as does the honorable member, and I am sure that they will take very little pride in the speech that has been delivered by their president. On the contrary, they will be ashamed of his utterances. Another statement which he made showed that he is utterly confused as to the purpose of the Bill. He talked about the distribution of nearly £1,000,000. This measure does not propose to distribute that sum of money.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The honorable member knows nothing about the Pill.

Mr. FLEMING.—What the Bill proposes to distribute is the £500,000 in the canteens fund. The McCaughey bequest cannot be distributed by the trustees to be created under this Bill; they can deal only with the interest on that money. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) also seemed to have a confused idea as to the proposal before the House, because he indicated that the funds which are the subject of this legislation might be used to relieve the Repatriation Department of some of its obligations. It is most definitely laid down that this money shall not be used for any purpose of the sort, and I am sure that the Government do not propose that it should. The Honorary Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie), when explaining the Bill, quoted a letter written in 1917, which showed that the Government had definitely laid down the policy that these funds shall not be used to relieve the Repatriation Department in any way of its duty to the soldiers. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) that women should come into the administration of this Bill more than is at present proposed. One of the chief functions of the trustees will be to provide for the women and children of soldiers, and we all know that women are much better at handling children than men can ever be. Therefore I cordially indorse the suggestion that more women should be placed on the central Trust. I also suggest that there should be at least one woman on each State Committee. The whole of the administration of the repatriation activities from the central body down to the hundreds of Committees distributed throughout the States is being altered, and the new scheme seems to be as good a one as can be devised. But in every case where they have power to do so, the Government should appoint women to positions on Trusts and Committees; for the Repatriation Committees as at present constituted do not usually include women. We must have more of the feminine touch if the Bill is to be administered as successfully as it should be.

I have a little cause of complaint against the Bill in that it is rather confused as to the handling of the two separate funds. I have already en-

deavoured to show that they are on different footings, but clause 6 provides—

(1) The trustees shall be charged with the duties of—

- (a) receiving and considering applications from the widows and orphans, widowed mothers, and other immediate dependants of deceased soldiers, and from seriously disabled soldiers, for assistance and benefits;

That applies quite readily and fittingly to the distribution of the canteens fund, and if it were laid down definitely that that provision applies only to the canteens fund, it would meet the situation exactly. But sub-clause *b* continues—

- (b) investing in securities of the Commonwealth or a State, or on fixed deposit, or on current account in any bank incorporated or carrying on business in the Commonwealth, such part of the fund as is not immediately required.

That part applies with perfect fitness to the McCaughey bequest; but the two funds should be kept apart and distinct, so that there would be no confusion in the minds of honorable members, and, possibly, in the minds of the trustees and Committees later. It has been stated in another place that it is hoped that the whole of the canteens fund will be distributed within a period of about six months. I think that estimate is too sanguine, but the money is the rightful property of the soldiers. They provided it, and it belongs to them; it is in no sense a governmental fund. But there was no other method than that which has been devised for the distribution of the money amongst its rightful owners. As soon as I returned from abroad my first action in the House was to inquire as to what was being done with the canteens fund and to draw attention to the fact that they should be used for the benefit of the women and children of the men who fell at the Front. I am delighted to see that the Government have taken action in that direction at the earliest opportunity, but it would be wise for them to lay down more definitely a clear-cut distinction between the funds drawn from the canteens and the McCaughey bequest. That would remove all difficulties and complaints and to a large extent eliminate the obstruction with which we are threatened when the measure goes into Committee.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [9.16].—I should not have risen but for the remarks of the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) about my late friend, Sir Samuel McCaughey.

Mr. BRENNAN.—What a lot of friends the millionaire always has!

Mr. JOWETT.—That remark is quite uncalled for, and I am sure that before the evening is over the honorable member who made it will be the first to regret it. It might have been thought that in the discussion of a Bill which deals, among other matters, with the administration and distribution of one of the most munificent bequests ever made for the benefit of the people of Australia, some note of gratitude would be heard. It would not have been out of place if the House had, by resolution, passed a vote of thanks or vote of appreciation to the memory of that great man. I say without hesitation that he was a great man. He was a personal friend of mine. I watched his career, and was, to some extent, brought in contact with him for the last forty years. At all events, if it was not thought necessary by the leaders of the House to ask honorable members to mark in that way their appreciation of the munificence of the bequest made by the late gentleman for the benefit of the people of Australia, at least we might have been spared the melancholy and distressing spectacle of a man who was one of Australia's greatest citizens being traduced on the floor of this House.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—It is to be hoped that we shall have no more of his kind.

Mr. JOWETT.—I trust that we shall have no more of this kind of insults to the memory of our great men, and also to the intelligence of the people. It was my good fortune to meet the late Sir Samuel McCaughey very many years ago, and to have watched his career during the last forty years. So far from such a man being regarded as in any way the enemy of the people or of any class of the people of Australia, I think that in his life-time he probably did as much to benefit, not only the whole of the people of Australia, but the members of that very Australian Workers Union, in whose name the honorable member for Darling has spoken to-night, as any other man who could be named.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order!

Mr. JOWETT.—I trust that I am confining myself within the four corners of this Bill, which deals with the administration of the bequest left by my late friend.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I hope that this matter will not be pursued any further. It was raised in debate, and has been sufficiently referred to. I have allowed a little latitude, because of certain references to the bequests of a deceased gentleman, which appeared to have some relation to the purposes of this Bill. But the debate is now developing too much into an attack and defence of the deceased gentleman himself, and I think ought now to return to the Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—It was with a desire to bring the minds of honorable members back to the Bill that I rose. I find that at least half of the funds dealt with by the Bill owe their origin to the munificence of the gentleman whose name has been so freely used to-night. It seemed to me, therefore, that this was a most fitting opportunity to make some reference to the source of the money with which the Bill deals.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The trouble is that the McCaughey bequest is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—How was it, then, that the honorable member introduced the name of Sir Samuel McCaughey? It does not lie in his mouth to reproach me with introducing into this debate something which does not properly pertain to it. As regards the means by which the late Sir Samuel McCaughey made his money, so far as I was able to discover in my long acquaintance with him, there was not one step which he took that did not redound not only to his credit, but to the benefit of the whole of the people of Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I must ask the honorable member not to pursue that subject further.

Mr. JOWETT.—I should be glad if we could obtain more information from the Government about clause 3, which is divided into two paragraphs. The first refers to all surplus moneys of canteens, and the second to "any moneys which are transferred to the trustees, and which the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, directs shall form part of the fund."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member will be in order in discussing principles, but not clauses, at the second-reading stage.

Mr. JOWETT.—I bow with the deepest respect to your ruling. I remain on my feet only for the purpose of eliciting further information from the Honorary Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) regarding the general purport of the Bill, which I find is "a Bill for an Act to make provision for the administration and disposal of the funds of Australian Imperial Force canteens, and for other purposes." Will the Minister disclose to the House what those other purposes are? I should like not only to elicit some information, but to impart a little, if I can do so, regarding the other purposes for which the Bill has been introduced.

Mr. RODGERS.—Give us a word on the benefactions in the Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—I thought I could properly introduce that subject by dealing with the benefactors of the Bill; but apparently this is neither the time nor the place to do so. I hope to deal further with these details in Committee.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [9.25].—It is quite evident that the last speaker (Mr. Jowett) rose merely for the purpose of making some very kind remarks about the president of the Australian Workers Union (Mr. Blakeley). He must be totally unacquainted with the provisions of the Bill, or he would not have made some of the remarks he did make. The House is virtually resolving itself into a society for the admiration of the persons named in the Bill; but, in my humble opinion, there are other people in the community who worked just as hard, and deserve just as much credit as they do. The Australian Imperial Force canteens showed a surplus over and above the money required to pay their expenses. Some of the men who ran the canteens put their money in to start them; and if the Honorary Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) likes to look up the correspondence from myself to the Defence Department on behalf of those people, he will find that they were done out of their money, which was never returned to them. We are dealing in this Bill with £500,000, which has come from

the soldiers, and I am satisfied that if the soldiers had had the appointment of a Trust to administer the fund, those appointed would not have been all of the one political colour, as the members of the Trust proposed by the Government are. The Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) will remember that we had funds similar to this in New South Wales for the relief of sufferers from the Bulli disaster, the *Ly-ee-moon* disaster, and others. The Australian people, with that magnificent generosity which they always show to those who require assistance, contributed large sums of money, which were vested in trustees, just as this Bill proposes. In those cases the trustees stuck to the money until the older people died, and the boys and girls, for whom it was intended, grew up. Then they turned round and told us that there was nobody to receive the money, and it remained unused for years. I have nothing to say against the proposed trustees personally, but their sympathies and views are so much at variance with those of the section that I come from and represent that it is possible, unless the Bill is altered, that the fund will not be administered in the spirit and intention which the men who supplied the money would have approved. I urge the Minister to have the fund administered in the way in which those men would have administered it themselves. The House would have heard nothing about an Inter-State Trust but for an interjection I made across the chamber. As soon as I got the Bill I saw the flaw in it, and interjected, when the Minister was speaking, that the members of the Trust all came from one State, and that there was no provision for administration in other States. The Minister replied, "We cannot have any one from other States on the Trust, because he would have to travel to Melbourne, and that would mean additional expenditure." I am sure the proposed trustees will not administer the fund properly. The Minister should show his honesty of purpose by withdrawing the Bill, and inserting the necessary new clauses in it. That would be a statesman-like way of dealing with the matter. Those who have been in political life for any length of time know that promises count for little.

Prominent in the Prime Minister's career are the promises made and not carried into effect. In my opinion, the promises made in regard to the Bill may never be fulfilled. I have nothing to say against the gentleman whose bequest will form part of the fund that will be the subject of the proposed Trust. He became a millionaire, and no one believes that any one can become a millionaire all of whose transactions are above suspicion. As to his money, he could not take it with him. Naked we come into the world and naked we go out of it again. I think it is a good thing. I feel sure that Mr. Ashton and Sir Joseph Carruthers, who are trustees under his will, and derive kudos from their connexion with his affairs, being public men, will not allow themselves to be deprived of anything that would decrease their political importance. I understand that some of his money was devised for the promoting of classical study at the University, and that there are bequests in aid of technical education as well, for the benefit of the children of soldiers. I knew the old fellow, and on one occasion stopped three days at his house. No doubt he was a good business man, and, like most Scotchmen, if he spent £1 he got £2 for it. It will always be my endeavour to see that funds subscribed for philanthropic purposes are administered in the spirit that prompted the beneficence of the givers. That will happen only when persons like myself are charged with their administration. I have had a long experience of affairs, and have been trustee of many funds, and still am a trustee. This is a very crude measure, and shows no special ability on the part of the draftsman, though he may have the excuse that he drew it on the information that was given to him, and was badly informed. It is not clear whether the children who are to benefit are to receive a weekly allowance or occasional doles, or whether widows are to be set up in businesses. The £500,000 which was earned in the canteens was contributed by those who drank beer and spirits most freely, because it was out of alcoholic drinks that the canteens made their profits. We are told that this is only a small measure; but it contains vital principles. Parliament should see that those for whom the money of which it disposes is intended get what has been provided for them. The Bill does not

show how the money is to be apportioned. Apparently, the Minister got a letter from Dr. Mary Booth, and it frightened him, because she is one of his constituents, and an opponent, and a pretty strong one at that. I hope that we shall be told definitely who are to be appointed to the Committees in the various States. In my opinion, this fund should be administered by representatives of the soldiers, not by ornamental society leaders. If you want a tooth drawn, you go, not to a stonemason, but to a dentist. At the present time nearly all those at the head of public affairs have a string of letters after their name so long that they might well be called alphabetical people, and some of them have so many letters in front of their name as well, that to address a letter to them in full would take from 9 in the morning until 5 in the evening. The Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) remembers the Bulli disaster in New South Wales, which brought into existence a fund, the trustees of which became regular professional philanthropists. They invested the money that had been subscribed for the victims of the disaster, appointed one friend as secretary and another as clerk, and applied the interest in miserable doles, such as were not intended by the subscribers, a woman with six children receiving 6d. a day for a child, and the children of the sufferers being treated as if they were different from other children. A well-known teetotaler in Sydney was in charge of the administration of the fund, and administered it in such a way that afterwards persons could not be got to subscribe to similar funds, and in New South Wales the fountains of charity were for a number of years sealed up. These canteen profits were made chiefly by the sale of alcohol.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No; that is not so.

Mr. WEST.—I have been in some of the canteens myself.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member not know that Mr. Lockyer made a new brand of beer containing only 2 per cent. of alcohol?

Mr. WEST.—It could not be called tea; it was beer, and not tea. Cold tea was no good to the soldiers.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Tell the Minister for the Navy about the Bulli Fund.

Mr. WEST.—The right honorable gentleman knows all about it. I am sure that he believes that its administration is no credit to those who have charge of it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This is not a similar proposal.

Mr. WEST.—I should like to know what is the difference. The right honorable gentleman is pretty cute as a politician, and I know no one who could more cleverly show that black is white; but he cannot explain the difference.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I could not make west into east.

Mr. WEST.—And the right honorable gentleman could not make the people of East Sydney break away from West. He tried very hard to do so; but they would not listen to him, and he had to clear out. When the people of East Sydney got West, they stuck to him, as they knew when they had a good thing. I advise the Government to withdraw this Bill, and submit another proposal which will set out specifically what is to be done in the distribution of these funds. I am aware that the measure was passed in another place, but I never take much notice of that other place, because this is the business House of this Parliament, since it controls the finances.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This is the people's House.

Mr. WEST.—It ought to be, but I am afraid that it is not just now. I am satisfied that, in respect to the McCaughey bequest, the trustees of Sir Samuel McCaughey's will will not permit any of the funds in their charge to be dealt with in any other way than that provided for in the will of which they are executors. Mr. Carruthers and Mr. Ashton are pretty cute men, and know well the duties of an executor of a will. The honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) has agreed that this Bill should make provision for State representation in connexion with this Trust. The Government would do well to take note of that, as their majority is not very large, and the Corner party are not quite to be depended upon. If members of the Government wish to keep their jobs, they will, in the circumstances, take my tip, and carry out their duties in a proper manner. I appeal to them again to permit this Bill to be so framed that the administration of these funds may be

placed in the hands of persons who know something of the conditions of those whom it is intended to benefit by their distribution.

Dr. EARLE PAGE (Cowper) [9.47].—I am one of those who are responsible for the existence of the surplus canteens fund. I should like, therefore, to say a few words about their distribution. The way in which I usually became acquainted with the canteens fund at the inception of the canteens was by putting a couple of pounds into the proposal to enable a start to be made. I never happened to be there at any time when there was to be a distribution of profits. I have been disappointed to-night to find that there appears to be a general desire on the part of the Government and the House to get rid of this £500,000 of accumulated profits in the quickest possible time. It has been suggested that these funds should be distributed in the course of about six months. I agree with the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming) that some means of dealing with this money should be devised other than the paying of it out as a sort of extra war gratuity in the way which has been suggested. The benefits provided for under clause 6 of the Bill appear to me to be benefits already provided for by other legislation passed by this Parliament, and are benefits the cost of which should be met by the whole of the people of this country. Those who have suffered by reason of the war should be treated in the most generous fashion, and not in a casual way. If this £500,000 is distributed in a casual way, as it will be if we leave its distribution to honorary trustees and honorary advisory Boards, there will be nothing whatever to show for it. It seems to me that the suggestion put forward by Sir Samuel McCaughey in his will is one which might properly be followed by this House in the disposition of the surplus canteen funds. An amount of £300,000 of the McCaughey bequest is to be devoted to education, and, in my view, the £500,000 of canteen surplus profits should be set aside to provide for the education of the orphans of men who fell on the other side, or of men who have returned disabled to Australia. If the Government take the step of augmenting the McCaughey bequest in this fashion there will not be wanting men of

similar spirit who, during their life-time, will give generously towards such a fund, and make secure the future education of the orphans of the men who died in doing their duty to their country. It is easy enough now to be generous, because the remembrance of the war, and the terrible danger we escaped, is present; but in ten or fifteen years' time, when the boys and girls are growing up, there will be less inclination to handle their cases liberally. I suggest that the sum I suggest should be capitalized and appropriated in a similar way to what is suggested in the McCaughey will. I further suggest that one of the executors, or at least a nominee of the executors of the will, should be one of the Trust which has the administration of the fund. I go further, and suggest that, as well as an Advisory Board for the central administration, we should go direct to the electorates for the next body of advice, and not worry about State administration. There are only seventy-five electorates; and if we distributed the money, even under the present arrangement, it would mean £7,000 or £8,000 in each electorate. If there is a State advisory body as well as a central body, we shall have continual circumlocution, and a great deal of expense, with very little satisfaction to anybody.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—We have to link up with the Repatriation Committees of each State.

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—The Local Repatriation Committees could much more readily work in the electorates than in the States. One of the difficulties of repatriation is that its administration is not sufficiently centralized. It seems to me that the country children will be penalized in the future by reason of their distance from the centres of education, and these are the children who should receive the greatest benefit under the will. I think it goes without saying that the constituted Trust should be from one centre. There is no reason whatever for any State jealousy; and if the suggestion I have made for electorate Advisory Boards is adopted, these will be in communication with the central Trust, and remove any occasion for such jealousy.

Mr. JAMES PAGE (Maranoa) [9.54].

—I will not detain the House many minutes, but merely desire to say a word

or two, because I was interested in the canteen funds as a member of the War Council in Queensland. All the positions under this Bill are honorary, and, therefore, the Country party cannot be accused of not aiming at economy on this occasion. When the Repatriation Bill was under consideration, the Minister in charge of it (Mr. Poynton) very pointedly said that all the business connected with the returned soldiers, particularly the pensions business, should be carried on under one roof. The Bill before us affects none but the soldiers themselves; this is practically the soldiers' fund, to which they themselves contributed, some directly and many of them indirectly; and if there is any part of the business that should be brought under one roof it is this. The Repatriation Department, with its great staff, should take over the distribution of this fund.

I have no fault to find with any of the persons who have been named in the Bill as trustees. One or two of them, as I know from personal observation, devoted the whole of their time, and in many instances much of their money, to making the canteens a success. Mrs. Deakin, the widow of the late Hon. Alfred Deakin, did honorary work during the war second to that of no woman in the Commonwealth; and if any one deserves a position on this Board or Committee it is that lady. Then there is Mr. Lockyer. Perhaps honorable members, or the soldiers themselves, do not know the interest that that man took in work of the kind, particularly in connexion with the canteen business. There was six months' leave of absence due to him for long and meritorious services in the Commonwealth, and he devoted that leave to fixing up the canteens throughout the Commonwealth. For all that work he hoped for no reward, and took none; and now, at the "final flutter," he comes forward and offers his services free.

There is no party politics in this Bill. Some of the gentlemen mentioned are good men. We know, for instance, what the Hon. George Swinburne, of Victoria, has done. He has done his "bit" here as far as any man could, and the others were all engaged in work connected with the soldiers, either at the Front or in the Commonwealth.

Then, again, I think the ladies who have been the leading lights of the Red Cross Society here deserve some recognition. Some of them were wholly and solely devoted to the welfare of the soldiers across the seas. They denied themselves of every pleasure, and in many cases of every comfort, in order to help the boys who went to the Front; and as there is no provision made for their recognition in the Bill, I should like to see, under the regulations, one, or, perhaps, three of them, appointed to the advisory bodies. No one could administer this part of the business better than some of the women of Australia.

I agree with my namesake, the honorable member for Cowper (Dr. Earle Page), in the suggestion that this money should be capitalized in perpetuity. There is, roughly speaking, about £1,000,000.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What would eventually become of the capital?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—In fifty years' time, what will that matter to us? If this £1,000,000 were invested at the present rate of interest, there would be an income of £60,000 per annum.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What is that among so many?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Has the honorable member ever known what it is to want a "quid"? Personally, I think that if from this fund could be distributed a few shillings per week to some of the widows and orphans now receiving assistance from the Repatriation Department, it would prove, in many instances, a godsend. In moving the second reading of this Bill the Minister said that he did not expect the money to last more than six months, and that the Trust would endeavour to get rid of it as speedily as possible.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Did not the honorable member advocate the payment of the war gratuity in cash?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—I did not advocate it, but I voted for it.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—And now that the Government propose to pay cash the honorable member wishes to have this money tied up.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—If the Government desire to throw it about, by all means let them do so. Thank God the

executors of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey will not allow them to throw his bequest about. That has been tied up in such a fashion that it will be of some value in the years to come. Do Ministers imagine that in ten years time the public of Australia will think as much of those men who went across the seas to save this country as they do to-day? Time works wonders. Every day the children of those who fell in the war will be growing up, and in a few years many of them will be able to look after themselves. It would be wisdom on the part of the Government to add to this fund one million pounds or two million pounds, so that the Trust might have interest amounting to £180,000 annually to distribute amongst necessitous cases. That would be money very wisely invested indeed. But it will not take long for the fund to disappear if it is distributed in the way that has been suggested. However, I recognise that it is idle for me or any member of the Opposition to make recommendations to the Minister. But the people outside will take notice of those who wished to do the best that is possible for the widows and orphans of our fallen soldiers.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Is it not a fact that Mr. Lockyer discussed this matter with the representatives of the soldiers, so that the scheme provided in the Bill is largely the result of their own conclusions? After all, it is the soldiers' money, is it not?

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Why does the State enact legislation to prevent people getting drunk? Is it not to save them from themselves? If the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) had very little to come and go upon, and if he were offered his choice between £100 now and £100 distributed over ten years, I know which he would choose.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This is the soldiers' money, and it is only the difficulty of returning it to them that is responsible for it being dealt with in this way.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Ministers say that the money is to be distributed amongst necessitous cases. I do not believe that there is a single soldier who, if consulted, would not say, "Whatever my cut is out of it, give it to the widows and orphans of those who have fallen." When we were winding up the canteen

in Brisbane after the buildings had been sold, there remained a certain amount of money to be distributed. A vote was taken as to what should be done with it, and I am pleased to say that there was not one soldier who did not say, "Give it to the widows and orphans of our mates who fell overseas." They have paid this money, they have "boozed" it up, and they are quite satisfied that the surplus shall go in the direction I have indicated. I agree with the honorable member for Cowper that if the money were invested wisely a good deal might be done with it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—He does not look as if he "boozed" much.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—He said that he put a couple of "quids" into the fund. A man does not need to be a drunkard to contribute to a fund of the kind, he merely requires to have a drink now and again, just as I do.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This money has been made out of 2d. beer.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—If the Minister has not had a "booze" in the canteens in the camps here, he occupies a unique position. I have never known a Minister to visit a camp without having something to drink, even if it were lemonade.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Amongst Mr. Lockyer's achievements, he induced the authorities to brew a new kind of beer for the canteens.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—And it took so much more of that beer to make the men drunk that the canteens became more profitable than they would otherwise have been. As one who was associated with Mr. Lockyer on the canteens in Queensland, I wish to pay my tribute to him for what he has done for the soldiers and Australia.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It is mainly his suggestion that we should act in this way.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—But "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety," even if those counsellors are only Labour men. Mr. Lockyer may not have thought of the wisdom of investing this money. But if he and the Government think that the method provided is the best for dealing with this matter, I have no objection to urge.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The Bill has been drawn loosely in order to give the Trust all the power that we can.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—I believe that the Repatriation Department should know nothing of the doings of the Trust which it is intended to constitute.

Mr. RODGERS.—That Department has neither created the fund nor endowed it.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—No. I can understand why this scheme has been put forward. It is intended to provide for the equitable distribution of the money amongst the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers. So far as I am concerned, I wish it all the good luck that can attend it. I have implicit faith in the trustees to be appointed, and particularly in Mrs. Deakin and Mr. Lockyer. With them upon the Trust I am certain that the fund will be as well administered as it would be if I were a member of the Trust myself.

Debate (on motion by Mr. Bowden) adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.

Senate.

Thursday, 29 April, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

WAR GRATUITY BILL.

The PRESIDENT announced the receipt of a message intimating that the House of Representatives had agreed to the amendments made by the Senate in this Bill.

VISIT OF PRINCE OF WALES.

AMNESTY TO MILITARY AND NAVAL PRISONERS.

Senator GARDINER asked the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

In view of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, will the Minister submit to Cabinet a proposal for the release of all members of the Australian Imperial Force or Naval Forces who served during the war, who are at present serving time either in Australia or abroad?

Senator PEARCE.—It is not proposed to extend any further clemency to prisoners. All sentences awarded prior to 18th July, 1919, in respect of purely

military offences only, have been remitted, and are still being remitted on the disembarkation of the military prisoners in their districts in Australia. Also, in regard to sentences awarded before that date for offences ordinarily punishable by civil law, an automatic remission of three weeks for every three months (not exceeding twelve months in all) is granted. In addition, all such cases are subsequently reviewed, and very substantial further remissions have been made. All sentences awarded after 18th July, 1919, are reviewed by a Sentences Revisory Committee, and many remissions have been granted. The greater proportion of sentences which have not been altogether remitted under the amnesty have been awarded for very grave criminal offences, such as manslaughter, stealing, robbery with violence, wounding with intent, forgery, &c.

WATERSIDE WORKERS

INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT.

Senator KEATING asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. The nature and scope of the proposed inquiry into the conditions of employment of waterside workers in Sydney?

2. Is it intended that such inquiry shall supersede, supplement, or in any way affect judicial action in respect of any proceeding or proceedings pending in the Arbitration Court?

3. Will the findings and evidence upon such inquiry be published or be made available for any such judicial action?

4. Will the findings and evidence upon a similar Melbourne inquiry last year by the Royal Commission (Mr. Dethridge) be published, and when?

5. If not, why not?

Senator MILLEN. — The answers are—

1. It is proposed to appoint a tribunal to inquire into the conditions of the Sydney waterside workers, with a view to effecting a settlement of matters in dispute on similar lines to those adopted in the case of the Melbourne wharf workers, including provision for—(a) Preference for original loyalists; (b) preference for returned soldiers; (c) equality of opportunity for employment for all others. It is proposed that the tribunal shall consist of one representative of the ship-owners, one representative of the Waterside Workers Federation, and an independent chairman, to be selected by the parties by mutual agreement, or, in the event of disagreement, to be nominated by the Commonwealth Government.

2 and 3. The findings of the tribunal will not have legal sanction. The tribunal is, in effect, a conference called by the Government to settle a long-standing dispute arising out of the seamen's strike, for which there appears to be no legal remedy. The parties will be asked to accept the findings of the tribunal when made, and abide by them.

4. No evidence is available. There is no objection to publication of the findings.

5. See No. 4.

WAR SERVICE HOMES.

Senator NEWLAND asked the Minister for Repatriation, *upon notice*—

1. Is it a fact that there are three departments engaged in the work of building soldiers' homes in South Australia, viz., the State Bank, the War Service Homes Commissioner (through the Commonwealth Bank), and the Soldiers' Land Settlement Committee?

2. Is it a fact that it is now proposed to establish a separate branch of the War Service Homes Commission for the purpose of erecting homes for returned soldiers?

3. Is it a fact that the annual cost of such branch will be in the neighbourhood of £6,000 yearly for salaries alone?

4. Have there been any complaints made regarding the work done, or on account of any delays with regard to the work undertaken by the State Bank in South Australia?

5. How many homes have been built by the State Bank and Land Settlement Committee of South Australia?

6. How many by the Commonwealth Department through the Commonwealth Bank?

7. What is the rate of interest charged in connexion with soldiers' homes by—

(a) the South Australian State Bank;

(b) the Commonwealth Department.

What is the maximum period allowed for repayment by—

(c) the South Australian State Bank;

(d) the Commonwealth Department?

8. Does the Minister think that a further duplication of State and Federal Departments is necessary or advisable?

Senator MILLEN.—The War Service Homes Commissioner supplies the following answers—

1. The War Service Homes Commission has been created to build homes exclusively for returned soldiers and their dependants. The State Bank builds for any person, and the Soldiers' Land Settlement Committee controls the expenditure for improvements on blocks allotted to soldier settlers.

2. At the present time the Commonwealth Bank, under an agreement with the War Service Homes Commissioner, administers certain portions of the War Service Homes Act, but in the near future all construction work will be carried out by the Commission itself. It is to provide machinery for this work that a separate branch of the Commission, in substitution for the construction branch of the Commonwealth Bank, is being created. No duplication will therefore result.

3. No.

4 and 5. I cannot say.

6. In addition twenty-six houses are in course of erection, whilst tenders have been invited for seventy-three others.

7. (a) 4½ per cent. where the applicant received a salary not exceeding £300 per year, 5 per cent. where the applicant receives over £300 per year in salary and a deposit of at least 40 per cent. of the value of the property; (b) 5 per cent.; no deposit is required; (c) I understand the period is 42 years; (d) thirty-seven years.

8. See answer to 2. It is an obligation on the War Service Homes Commissioner to provide homes for discharged members of the Australian Imperial Force, irrespective of the salary they may be receiving or of whether they are possessed of the requisite deposit required under the State Housing Scheme.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Motion (by Senator MILLEN) agreed to—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Public Works Committee Act 1913-1917, the following senators be appointed members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, viz., Senator Henderson, Senator Needham, and Senator Newland.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Motion (by Senator MILLEN) agreed to—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Committee of Public Accounts Act 1913-1917, the following senators be appointed members of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts, viz., Senator Crawford, Senator Earle, and Senator McDougall.

AUSTRALIAN SOLDIERS' REPATRIATION BILL.

In Committee (Consideration of House of Representatives' amendments):

Clause 8—

1. The Commission shall consist of three members, who shall be appointed by the Governor-General.

2. A duly authenticated organization, recognised or acknowledged by the Minister as being a body representing returned soldiers throughout the Commonwealth, may submit to the Minister a list containing the names of not less than three persons from which the organization recommends that a selection be made of a person to be appointed as one of the Commissioners, and the Governor-General may appoint a person selected from that list to be one of the Commissioners.

House of Representatives' Amendments.—Omit "A duly authenticated" and insert "Any"; omit "recognised or acknowledged by the Minister as being a body"; omit "that list" and insert "any list so submitted."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.8].—In dealing with the amendments made by the House of Representatives in this Bill as it left the Senate, I should like first of all to intimate that most of them are non-controversial, inasmuch as they provide merely for greater clarity of language, a little liberalization in respect to one or two classes of dependants, and generally are such as I feel sure the Senate will accept as improvements in the Bill. There are only two amendments in respect of which I propose to ask the Senate to disagree with what has been proposed by the other branch of the Legislature. I shall indicate those as we proceed. The House of Representatives has struck out the words "A duly authenticated" and inserted the word "Any". I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.11].—The House of Representatives has also struck out the words "recognised or acknowledged by the Minister as being a body". That is practically a consequential amendment upon the first. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [3.12].—I did not hear the Minister very well, and thought he was asking the Committee to disagree with these amendments. I sincerely hope that they will not be agreed to, because if we provide for any organization at all to submit names for membership of the Commission we shall immediately open the door to log-rolling in its very worst form.

Senator GARDINER.—You think log-rolling should be confined to the organization to which you belong?

Senator FOLL.—I hold no brief for any particular organization. I belong to two, one of which is political and the other non-political. We have had in Queensland such an experience of log-rolling that I ask the Committee to consider seriously before opening the door to any organization, political or non-political, to submit names for a seat on the Commission. If I had heard the Minister clearly I should have asked him to reconsider the matter and to agree to insert the words "any non-political organization," because if we once open the door for a political organization to submit names,

we immediately give the Government then in power an opportunity to make a political appointment. Suppose, for instance, that the party of which Senator Gardiner is a member occupied the Treasury bench. What would be the position then?

Senator MILLEN.—Perhaps that is what you are afraid of.

Senator FOLL.—We have every reason to be afraid of it. If there is a Labour Government in power, and a body of men form themselves into what they call a Soldiers' Labour party—and they have as much right to do so as others have to form a Soldiers' National party—what will happen? We know that our opponents are experts at log-rolling.

Senator GARDINER.—You surely do not mean that?

Senator FOLL.—I do mean it, because of our recent experiences in Queensland. My colleagues from that State can bear out what I say. A few men could form themselves into an organization and claim to be a soldiers' organization, for the purpose of submitting a name to the Labour Government, and the Labour Government could accept the nomination, with the result that the appointment would immediately become a political appointment. I am not advocating that the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League should be the only body with the right to submit names. Let any soldiers' organizations submit names, so long as they are non-political organizations; but if once we allow political organizations to submit names, we immediately open the door for the making of political appointments by whatever Government happens to be on the Treasury bench at the time.

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.15].—I dissent from Senator Foll's suggestion that the party which happens to be in charge of the Treasury bench for the time being should decline to pass legislation which would be regarded as acceptable as long as that party remained in power, simply for fear of something that a future Government may do. We ought to pass the thing if we think it right, irrespective of what any future Government may elect to do with it. The honorable senator wishes the right of nomination to be limited to non-political parties. Frankly, I do not know such a thing. I hear all sorts of parties calling themselves non-

political, but in the last resort it is found that they drift into politics sooner or later. Even the principal Soldiers League calls itself non-political, but if you read its manifesto you find that half the items are debatable subjects which enter into the realm of politics.

Senator FOLL.—They are not affiliated with any present party.

Senator MILLEN.—They are not so affiliated to-day, but it is clear that they are endeavouring to form a party themselves, or, alternatively, that they will support whatever political party tries to achieve the objects for which they stand. It is largely a matter of camouflage to talk of non-political parties to-day. Any number of instances could be quoted of organizations, formed for quite desirable objects, that started out with the declaration that they were non-political, but before long took an active part at elections in backing those candidates who promised to support the things they desired to achieve. If they are loyal to their objects, they must use all the tools which come to their hand, in order to attain them. Senator Foll need not be alarmed about this matter. The ordinary citizen walking in the streets has the right to nominate anybody. He can write to the Minister enclosing the nomination of somebody else, or even of himself, as a member of the Commission, but the responsibility of making the selection falls on the Minister. Whether the nomination is made by one or twenty organizations does not impair the two facts: first, that the right exists to-day, and, secondly, that upon the Minister ultimately falls the responsibility of saying which of the persons nominated he deems best for the position. I am unable to share Senator Foll's fears, and therefore ask the Committee to agree to the amendment made by another place.

Motion agreed to.

Further verbal amendment agreed to.

Clause 10—

Subject to this Act, the members of the Commission first appointed under this Act shall hold office for the term of five years, and shall be eligible for re-appointment.

House of Representatives' amendment.—Omit "five" and insert "three".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.19].—This is one of the amendments with which I propose to ask the Committee to disagree. I move, accordingly—

That the amendment be disagreed to.

The Bill provided a term of five years for the Commission. Another place has reduced that term to three years. We are giving the Commission very wide powers. Having largely of our own volition passed those powers into the hands of the Commission, we ought to give the Commission such security of tenure as will insure its exercise of those powers in a free and independent way. We recognise that principle in appointing Judges for life, in order that they may perform their duties without the necessity of shaping their course so as to secure re-appointment. Most Commissions are appointed for seven years, but I do not suggest that term in this case. In view of the work to be accomplished, seven years would be too long; but five years is a reasonable period. I ask the Committee to disagree with the amendment in order to secure the placing of the Commissioners in a position of independence.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [3.30].—I think it would be just as well to retain the three years' period, although I have no very great interest in the matter. We ought to remember that the members of the other branch of the Legislature are elected for three years, and as they make and unmake Ministries, why should not our legislation conform to that period? To my mind the principle is a most excellent one.

Senator MILLEN.—The members of this Chamber are elected for six years. According to the honorable senator's argument, therefore, we ought to make the term for which the commissioners are appointed six years.

Senator GARDINER.—But the Senate does not make and unmake Governments. We fixed the period for which the commissioners are to be appointed at five years, and the other branch of the Legislature has deliberately altered it to three years. Is it worth while disagreeing with the amendment? What is the value of the difference between the views of the two Houses?

Senator DE LARGIE.—The honorable senator is in a very amiable mood to-day.

Senator GARDINER.—I am, and I hope that I shall remain so. I trust, therefore, that Senator de Largie will not interject too often. I would reserve our disagreements with the amendments of another place to amendments involving matters of substance. The fact that the

Bill has been returned with a sheaf of amendments covering four pages suggests that not very much consideration was given to it here.

Senator FAIRBAIRN (Victoria) [3.24].—If we accepted the suggestion of Senator Gardiner and agreed to a term of three years we should be following the practice of the United States, where the majority of civil servants merely hold office during the period that their political party remains in power. It will be generally recognised that that would be a very bad principle to adopt. These commissioners should be quite independent of politics—indeed, their positions should be somewhat analogous to those occupied by our Judges. They will be called upon to undertake a vast work, and in three years they will only just about have mastered their jobs. It would be a pity, therefore, if we did not disagree with the amendment of the other House. Personally, I hope that the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) will stick to his guns.

Senator KEATING (Tasmania) [3.26].—If it were seriously contended that the work of the Repatriation Commission would terminate within three years, there might be some justification for adopting the amendment of the other branch of the Legislature. But if the work of this body is to extend over an indefinite period and we could effect a compromise with another place by making the term of their appointment seven years, I think it would be wise for us to do so. Senator Gardiner's arguments were not so much in favour of the amendment which has been made in the Bill as they were condemnatory of it. We all know that the election of a new House of Representatives may mean the formation of a new Government. That might conceivably result in the appointment of fresh commissioners if the term of their appointment were limited to three years.

Senator FOLL.—And they might be political appointments.

Senator KEATING.—The practice suggested would certainly tend to make such appointments of a purely political character. Had the other House amended the Bill to provide for a seven years' period I would have supported it. In the circumstances, however, I hope that the Minister will adhere to the term of five years, which I regard as the most satisfactory.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [3.27].—I would remind honorable senators that this amendment emanates from a party which has a majority in the other House. I have no desire to discuss the question of party appointments, but I do not think there is any warrant for the charge of log rolling which was mentioned by Senator FOLL. In most Government appointments the fitness of men for the position has ever been the chief concern of Ministers. I make that statement as the result of a long and active association with party politics.

Senator KEATING.—Why, the honorable senator's party in New South Wales is recalling an Agent-General.

Senator GARDINER.—The gentleman who is being recalled was appointed six days after the then Government had been defeated at the polls. I do not think that even Senator Keating will approve of an appointment to an important office in such circumstances.

Senator EARLE.—Would not the appointment of three commissioners for a shorter term militate against securing the services of the best men?

Senator GARDINER.—I think that it would be an advantage to everybody. At the end of three months it may be discovered that a bad appointment has been made. No officer who discharges his duties efficiently for three years is likely to be displaced by any Government. But if we insist upon fixing the term for which these commissioners are to be appointed at five years it may possibly be found that it would have been convenient at the end of three years to remove one of them because of the perfunctory manner in which he was performing his duties.

Senator FOLL.—Cannot that be done at any time by Parliament?

Senator GARDINER.—No, because there must be ample reason for the removal of any public official from his office. If there is no charge against him he cannot be removed before the expiration of his term, though I could quite understand that it would be a convenience for the Government to have power to remove him at an earlier period. The difference between three years and five years is not very great, and I take it that at the end of three years the principal business of the Commission will have been completed. If there is any

fear in the minds of honorable senators that any party will make political appointments, all I can say is that that fear is not justified by my experience in State and Federal politics over a great many years.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [3.33].—I am more concerned with the selection of a suitable man for this position than the term of his appointment. Two years have elapsed since we passed the first Repatriation Bill, though it seems as if it were but yesterday, and if Senator Gardiner were right there would be no need for a reappointment of the Commissioners. We cannot, however, anticipate that we are near the end of our repatriation work. During the first three years of his term a Commissioner will necessarily acquire a great deal of knowledge, which will be of value to him in his future work, but if the appointment is for only three years, a Commissioner at the end of that term might be looking for a job. He may or may not be reappointed. If a man is not efficient enough for an appointment of five years, he is not worthy of appointment for three years. There is no force in Senator Gardiner's argument that we ought to accept the amendment made by the House of Representatives because it is the opinion of the majority of the other House and the same party has a majority in the Senate. The five years' term is preferable on all grounds, because a Commissioner will get to know his work and be able to perform it more efficiently.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 11—

(3) Upon the commencement of this Act, all property vested in the Minister, or in a State Repatriation Board, in pursuance of any Act repealed by this Act, shall become vested in the Commission.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit sub-clause (3), and insert the following sub-clauses:—

“(3) All real and personal property, securities and funds, and all rights of action in respect of any such property, securities and funds, vested, in pursuance of any Act repealed by this Act, in the Minister or in a State Repatriation Board, or in any person on behalf of or in trust for the Minister or any such Board, shall, upon the commencement of this Act, become vested in the Commission, subject to the trusts upon which the same are held by the Minister or by that Board or person.

"(4) All the rights of State War Councils in respect of advances made by them under the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Fund Act 1916, shall, upon the commencement of this Act, become vested in, and exercisable by, the Commission."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.35].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

There is no alteration in the purpose of the clause, but the authorities have recommended the amendment with the object of expressing the position with greater clarity. It amplifies the provisions whereby property vested in the Minister or State Repatriation Boards is vested in the Commission, and gives the Commission the right to recover moneys due to the old State War Councils under the Australian Repatriation Fund. Some money is still due to those now defunct bodies, and it is proposed to give the Commission legal power to collect it.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 14—

(2) A duly authenticated organization, recognised or acknowledged by the Minister as being a body representing returned soldiers, may in respect of each State submit to the Commission a list. . . . The Governor-General may appoint a person, selected from that list by the Commission, to be a member of that Board.

House of Representatives' Amendments.—Omit "A duly authenticated", and insert "Any"; omit "recognised or acknowledged by the Minister as being a body"; omit "that list" and insert "any list so submitted".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.38].—I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

The Senate has already agreed to an amendment made by the other House to give any organization the right to submit a nomination for the central Commission, and the object of those amendments is to give any organization the same right of nomination for membership of the State Boards.

Motion agreed to.

Further verbal amendment agreed to.

Clause 17—

(1) A Commissioner, or an Acting Commissioner, shall be deemed to have vacated his office if he engages, during his term of office, in any employment outside the duties of his office.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After "any" insert "paid".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.39].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This will make it clear that the Commissioner or Acting Commissioner shall only be deemed to have vacated his office if he engages in any paid employment. As the measure left the Senate the provision stated that his office would be vacated if he engaged in any employment.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 17—

(2) A Commissioner, an Acting Commissioner, or a member of a Board shall be deemed to have vacated his office if—

(c) he becomes in any way concerned or interested in any contract or agreement made by or on behalf of the Commission; or in any way participates or claims to be entitled to participate in the profit thereof, or in any way benefit or emolument arising therefrom.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit paragraph (c) and insert the following paragraph:—

"(c) he, in any way, otherwise than as a member, and in common with the other members, of an incorporated company consisting of more than twenty-five persons—

(i) becomes concerned or interested in any contract or agreement made by or on behalf of the Commission; or

(ii) participates, or claims to be entitled to participate, in the profit of any such contract or agreement or in any benefit or emolument arising therefrom."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.41].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Honorable senators will remember that when this clause was before us there was some discussion as to the limit to be placed upon the Commissioner. An amendment was drafted at the time which met with the wishes of the Committee, but which the law officers thought was couched in somewhat ambiguous language. The purpose of the new paragraph is, very rightly, to prevent a Commissioner or Acting Commissioner from being interested in any undertaking or company deriving profits from transactions with the Commission.

Senator SENIOR.—That makes the amendment quite clear, and it is really the same as what passed this Chamber.

Senator MILLEN.—Yes; and it is in keeping with the language adopted in other Commonwealth Acts.

Motion agreed to.

Consequential amendment agreed to.

Clause 23—

Upon the death or incapacity the Commonwealth shall, subject to this Act, be liable to pay to the honorable member or his dependants, or both, as the case may be, pensions in accordance with this Act: provided that—

- (ii) in cases of the incapacity of a member of the Forces—by the member or a dependant not more than six months after the termination of the appointment or discharge of the member.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Leave out "termination of the appointment or".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.43].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

As the word "discharge" is already defined, the words "termination of the appointment" are unnecessary.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment in clause 26 agreed to.

Clause 32 (Payment of lump sum may be substituted in certain cases).

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "pensioner", insert "member of the Forces."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.44].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The clause has for its object the payment in certain cases of the pension in a lump sum. If the amendment is agreed to, the payment will be granted upon the application of a member of the Forces.

Motion agreed to.

Consequential amendments agreed to.

Clause 37—

A Board may reject a claim for a pension by a dependant of a member of the Forces, or may terminate any pension granted to such a dependant, if the Commission is satisfied that the grant or continuance of the pension is undesirable.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "Commission" and insert "Board."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.47].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This is clearly a mistake in either typing, printing, or drafting, and it is proposed to correct the error that has occurred.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 45—

The provisions of this Act shall extend to the case of any soldier of the Imperial Reserve Forces called up for active service who at the commencement of the present state of war was *bonâ fide* resident in Australia, as if that soldier were a member of the Forces as defined in this Act.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit all the words after "this" (line 1) up to and including "Act" (line 7), and insert—

"Part shall extend to—

- (a) any soldier of the Imperial Reserve Forces called up for active service during the present war; and

- (b) any person who is serving or has served during the present war in the Naval or Military Forces of any part of the King's Dominions other than the Commonwealth, on active service outside that Dominion,

on proof to the satisfaction of the Commission that he was, immediately before being called up or before his enlistment, as the case may be, domiciled in the Commonwealth."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.48].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The effect of this amendment is to include in the benefits of the Act those Australians who served in other units of the King's Forces. A similar provision is in the original Repatriation Act, but it was not included in the benefits as regards pensions. The insertion of this amendment provides that the difference between the pension received from the Imperial authorities and that to which they would be entitled if enrolled in the Australian Forces will be paid.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments in clause 46 agreed to.

Clause 47 (Commission shall make recommendations as to regulations).

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "in the nature of"; insert "payments or allowances in the nature of, or supplementary to".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.49].—I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The clause as originally presented is not disturbed, but has been made less ambiguous by the language now adopted.

Motion agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After "mothers" insert "or stepmothers".

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.50].—As this clause left the Senate there were included amongst the beneficiaries under this part of the Act—

The mothers of deceased or incapacitated soldiers.

The House of Representatives has amended the Bill by inserting after the word "mothers" the words "and step-mothers." I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "widows and were, prior to the enlistment of those soldiers, dependent upon them", insert "either widowed, divorced, or deserted."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.51].—The next amendment made by the House of Representatives is contained in a sub-clause which originally provided that—

The Commission may make recommendations to the Governor-General for regulations for the granting of assistance and benefits, not being in the nature of pensions, as provided for in Part III. of this Act.

(d) Where by reason of special circumstances the Commission considers that assistance and benefit should be granted to—

(iii) The mothers of deceased or incapacitated Australian soldiers—(a) who are widows and were prior to the enlistment of those soldiers dependent upon them.

The House of Representatives have amended this paragraph by omitting the words "widows, and were prior to the enlistment of those soldiers dependent upon them" and inserting the words "either widowed, divorced, or deserted."

The effect of the amendment is to include divorced and deserted wives as beneficiaries under the Act.

Senator ROWELL.—If divorced on the petition of the wife?

Senator MILLEN.—I presume that it is intended to include the divorced woman whether she obtained the divorce herself or otherwise. I hope that honorable senators will not try to make the Repatriation Department a judge of morals in these matters. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "and" (paragraph (d) iv).

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.53].—As the Bill left the Senate paragraph d, sub-paragraph iv, read—

The incapacitated fathers of deceased or incapacitated Australian soldiers who were, prior to the enlistment of those soldiers, dependent upon them, and.

The House of Representatives proposes that the word "and" be left out, and that is necessary, because additional paragraphs have been added, and the word "and" should follow the penultimate paragraph. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—Omit "or stepmothers" (paragraph (d) v).

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.54].—Sub-paragraph 5 of paragraph d originally read—

The mothers or stepmothers, being either widowed, divorced or unmarried, of Australian soldiers who were born out of wedlock.

Step-mothers having been provided for by a previous amendment agreed to, it is proposed that the word should be left out of this paragraph. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Remaining amendment agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After clause 47, insert the following clause:—

"47A. The Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Minister, have power to assist soldiers in establishing industries on a co-operative basis, such industries to include the manufacture of boots, woollen goods, and clothing, tanning, wool-scouring, feltmongering (and kindred industries), saw-milling, and other enterprises."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.56].—This is one of the two amendments which I have intimated I intended to ask the Senate to disagree with. I am well aware that there has been put forward various suggestions for the repatriation of soldiers by establishing them in businesses, co-operative and otherwise. But I ask the Committee to consider some of the difficulties, and even evils, which might arise if this proposed new clause were agreed to. I assumed from the remarks made in another place that what was in the mind of the honorable member who moved this amendment

was that it was a proposal by means of which it would be possible to place in businesses a number of men now awaiting employment, and on the unemployed register of the Repatriation Department. I do not want what I am about to say to be in any way misinterpreted, or to appear to cast the slightest reflection on our returned soldiers as a whole. I have already referred to the fact that their readiness to go back to civil life is the highest testimony to their character that could be given. Still, I do ask the Committee to recognise that there must necessarily be amongst the men who remain with us towards the end of repatriation a very considerable percentage of those who, for some reason or another, are very difficult to place. Many of these may not have been noted for steadiness before they went to the war—

Senator GUTHRIE.—Or were men who had no permanent employment.

Senator MILLEN.—That is so. Amongst the men on our books, there is a considerable percentage of those who, in my view, would represent, perhaps, the least satisfactory persons to start businesses on their own account. This provision, I point out could not be limited to men now on the unemployed register of the Department. If the Government, as a part of their repatriation policy, are to find money to establish in business men who have not yet returned to civil life, they cannot deny the same privilege to those who have already returned to civil life. The benefit of this clause cannot be restricted to men who are awaiting employment to-day. If this clause is agreed to, any returned Australian soldier, no matter when he was discharged, must have a right to the benefits of the provision. I have not the exact figures with me, but I think that upwards of 200,000 men have passed through the Department, or have gone direct themselves to their niche in civil life. If this clause is agreed to, not merely the men who are unemployed to-day, but thousands of those who are already satisfactorily employed, but animated by the ambition of most young Australians to start business on their own account, rather than continue in employment, will seek assistance under this provision.

Senator ROWELL.—They could start businesses with their gratuity money.

Senator MILLEN.—As Senator Rowell points out, if there is any desire on the part of many of these men to engage in these enterprises, the majority of them will be able to give effect to that desire by means of the gratuity recently passed by Parliament. If the Committee approves of the proposition to advance money to the returned soldiers generally to start business on their own account, it seems to me they will be throwing upon the Repatriation Department an obligation for which it is not intended.

Senator GUTHRIE.—Is not the principle of co-operation involved in this amendment?

Senator MILLEN.—It is; but if we advance money to half-a-dozen soldiers to enable them to go into a co-operative business, we cannot logically refuse to make a proportionate advance to an individual soldier who wishes to go into business on his own account. In the last analysis, therefore, the proposed new clause is a proposition to advance money to every soldier to make a start on his own account, and, in my view, it would be, not only unnecessary, but dangerous to approve of such a proposal.

Senator GUTHRIE.—If 100,000 soldiers agreed to co-operate in a business, would the Minister object to money being advanced to them for that purpose?

Senator MILLEN.—It would be a most dangerous experiment for the Commonwealth to find the money to start 100,000 men in a co-operative enterprise. I cannot dissociate from this amendment very many applications made to me to start returned soldiers in business enterprises in the country towns, and chiefly in the State of Victoria. I think I am safe in saying that three out of every four of these cases submitted to me have been proposals to take up some defunct or bankrupt business. In one town, at no great distance from Melbourne, there is a wilderness of machinery started some years ago under a high-sounding name as a saw-milling plant. Leading townsmen, who are hard-headed business men, came along and described the magnificent opportunity which was here afforded to establish several soldiers in business. My answer was to suggest that they were business men, and although this opportunity had stared them

in the face, they allowed the machinery to lie idle for years, and I preferred that the experiment should be tried with the stay-at-homes rather than with men who had gone to the Front. Other leading townsmen proposed that returned soldiers should be assisted to develop a defunct mine in their neighbourhood. Another proposal submitted was that returned soldiers should be assisted to take over a bankrupt engineering shop which was to be sold. It was pleaded that this would be a magnificent business in which to start returned soldiers. I felt that it would certainly not be a good thing for the soldiers if it had failed in the hands of other people. I have felt, also, that underlying these proposals there has been one word for the soldier and six for the residents of certain towns, who would like to have some public money spent in their midst. I should be more disposed to approve of this proposition if those responsible for it said that they were willing to find a percentage of the money required to give it effect. If some of the gentlemen who have been so ardent in their desire to have industries started by the returned soldiers showed their faith in the proposition by agreeing to subsidize the proposals, or to advance £1 for every £1 advanced by the country, for this purpose, I should have greater faith in the value of the proposals they make. If the proposed new clause were agreed to, I believe that its effect would be to unsettle a large number of returned men who have satisfactorily found some niche in civil life, and would also start in business a large number of men who can make no possible claim to sufficient experience to warrant their success. It may be said that the responsibility is thrown on the Minister for Repatriation of saying yes or no to any proposition under this clause. I should like to say, as the Minister for the time being, that if it is desired to start an Industries Promotion Board, for that is involved, it should be apart from the Repatriation Department. I do not feel competent to say whether a particular enterprise may be good, bad, or indifferent. Quite different machinery from that which I have created for carrying on the Repatriation Department must be called into being to handle such proposals. The work of the Repatriation Department has gone along not without its jolts and jars, but still for the most part satisfactorily.

But if a new element such as this is to be introduced it will involve starting the work of repatriation *de novo*, and men long since settled again in civil life will come along and claim that advances should be made to them under this clause to start business on their own account. I move—

That the amendment be disagreed to.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [4.3].—I have listened to all that the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) has said, and again I remind the Committee that this amendment could not have been carried in the House of Representatives if the Government had a majority opposed to it. I hope that the Senate is not to be made a convenience of to enable the Government to correct what has been done in another place if they disapprove of it. The House of Representatives has in this case deliberately inserted a clause which, in my opinion, might be made of material benefit to the soldiers. The one or two cases mentioned by the Minister for Repatriation of proposals for advances in support of doubtful enterprises prove nothing. If we take the saw-milling industry I venture to say that amongst our returned soldiers we should find men who would make a success of that business where, perhaps, private enterprise has so far failed. The returned soldiers have had a wider experience than most of us, and they have done things abroad. I believe that it would be in the interests not only of the returned soldiers, but of the community as a whole, to invest money in the establishment of returned men in business on their own account under the new clause inserted by the House of Representatives. What could be better than to have a body of ten men joined in a co-operative saw-milling business at Rabaul, which is subject to our control under the mandate to supply the timber necessary for the construction of soldiers' homes. At the rate at which the work is proceeding at present we shall probably be constructing these homes for the next ten years. I am credibly informed that there is very valuable timber in the new territory to which I have referred, which should be utilized in the construction of soldiers' homes.

Senator ROWELL.—The returned soldiers could invest their war gratuity money in that business.

Senator GARDINER.—That is so. The Government could advance part of that money for these co-operative enterprises.

Senator MILLEN.—That would be advancing the soldiers' own money, but that is not the proposal of the amendment.

Senator GARDINER.—If the new clause is agreed to, the proposed co-operative concern might easily be financed out of the gratuity money. It would be quite impossible for one or two men to undertake the timber industry in Rabaul, for instance, owing to the distance, the obstacles in the way, the difficulty of getting shipping, and the fact that they would have to fight the Timber Combine and the Shipping Ring. Those considerations would be enough to frighten out men with a lot of capital, and would certainly frighten out a few soldiers. But let a few soldiers form a co-operative concern with their own capital, such as their war gratuity money, and be backed up by the Minister, because the Minister's approval is necessary, with a guarantee from the Government of shipping for the material they produce, and see what will happen. My mind is running particularly on the new Possessions in the Pacific. I can imagine ten men going there with a few thousand pounds worth of machinery and beginning operations with all the native labour available.

Senator MILLEN.—What colour is the native labour?

Senator GARDINER.—Black. I am not to be bluffed by the Minister's insinuation that I am advocating black labour. They are the natives of the Islands. They can be profitably employed there, and to their own advantage, in helping the natives of this island continent. I am using this particular instance of a soldiers' co-operative saw-milling concern, which the Government could undertake to help by providing ships. Western Australia would not like it, lest it should interfere with its timber trade, such as the wooden boxes, and wooden heads, and other wooden things that come here from that State. The West Australians would certainly see the danger of the new territories being used to come into competition with their particular timber industry, the profits of which have got into a very few hands. I worked in the building trade, and can assure the Committee that the price of oregon in

Sydney to-day is about ten times what it was about twenty-five years ago.

Senator MILLEN.—I never remember oregon at less than 12s. or 14s. per 100 superficial feet.

Senator GARDINER.—At the time I speak of it could be purchased in Sydney at about 9s. per 100 super., and is now about 90s. I recognise that there is now a greater scarcity of timber, and greater cost of material and labour, but the real trouble is the existence of a timber combine which has the whole of the timber business of the world in its hands. The best way to fight that Combine would be with the same men as fought for all our other industries. I would not confine them to the new territories. They could exploit the forests of Australia. Then let us turn from timber to coal. We know how enormous and far-reaching are the coal deposits of Australia, and with our increased and increasing population there is ample room for taking the Coal Combine out of the hands of a few coal kings who control it now. The soldiers could do that, if permitted by this measure, supported by the Minister, and encouraged by the Government. We could follow co-operation in many other directions, but I know this Government has no intention to do it. They will not even allow a clause to be included in this Bill to permit other Governments to do it.

Senator DE LARGIE.—Do you know the history of co-operation in coal mining in your own State?

Senator GARDINER.—I heard one of the shrewdest business men it was ever my lot to listen to, speaking of an enterprise they were trying to persuade him to go into, say to his son, "Don't go into that, pioneers nearly always go down. It will be successful, but not by those who take it up first." The failures of the past should never be used as a reason why a thing should not be a success eventually. The failure of co-operation twenty years ago may have been due to the management of that particular concern, or to the conditions under which it operated, or to its members themselves. So far as co-operation among the soldiers is concerned, even if it costs us money, it would be money admirably spent if we assisted parties of soldiers to erect saw-mills or embark in other desirable undertakings. When the men went

away to fight, nobody grumbled about paying them their wages while they were engaged in the work of destruction. The only thing that prevented them being paid a better wage was the fact that the concern was so enormous that it could not be done. But if they could be maintained, clothed, fed, and equipped for years for that purpose, what is wrong, now that they are back, with saying to them, "We engaged you to go and fight, and maintained you; you gave us intense satisfaction while you were fighting, and we shall never cease to admire your splendid performances. Now that you are back, and want to form co-operative enterprises, we are not going to stop at a shilling or two." That would not be an over-generous thing for the people of Australia to say, nor would it be too much to expect the Minister to welcome a claim of that kind.

Senator ROWELL.—We do not want to wet-nurse them for ever.

Senator GARDINER.—I know the distinction that is made on the other side. It is not wet-nursing them when they are employed to fight for other people's interests, but it is wet-nursing them to help them to fight in their own interests. If it is to the benefit of the people represented opposite, it is the soldier's duty to do it, but if it is for the soldier's benefit, we immediately hear the cry, "We cannot wet-nurse them; we cannot support them." Honorable senators opposite will take very fine care that they would not support the soldiers. The world is moving towards co-operation. Why, then, should we not follow the lead of another place by saying that if the soldiers want to move with the times we will help them instead of retarding them? I do not claim that it is a generous thing to do. It is merely common-sense and our common duty. If the Minister does not approve of an enterprise, his "no" puts an end to any scheme that he thinks unsatisfactory. His "yes" will give effect to any scheme that he thinks will be a success. I am not afraid either of the business capacity of the soldiers or of the failures, because they would be so few. Throughout Australia at the present time there are opportunities simply waiting to be picked up, waiting for organized brains to use the potentialities of this country for making good money out of

them. I heard a soldier discussing with a few of his mates a proposal for co-operatively tilling unused lands—that is, to enter into arrangements with the holders of lands to lease them to grow wheat, oats, potatoes, and all those things of which the community is so badly in need. He had an excellent scheme for sending advance agents round to secure land in certain districts. When they secured sufficient land in one district, he proposed to arrange with the manufacturers of machinery to send certain classes of machines there, and then the tilling of the land would go on. They would move from place to place, not looking to purchase land, but merely making arrangements to use the lands lying idle to-day in the rich districts, and used only to graze a few head of stock but capable of producing much more money if put under intense cultivation. A scheme of that kind would be of immense value to Australia at this juncture. In these soldiers we have the men who can carry it out. We know what they have done. The men who learned to handle big guns would soon learn to handle big ploughs and harvesting machinery. With all these possibilities for the employment of soldiers in co-operative societies, why jib at this proposal? I know the Committee will reject it, because the Minister asks them to do so. At the same time we could think of nothing better to benefit the soldiers, and if the Government would adopt it, and take a supervising interest in it, and give the soldiers sufficient encouragement to start co-operative businesses, there is no saying where it would end. I believe that in his heart Senator Millen thinks the same, because he said, "We cannot do this for the men who have to be repatriated, and refuse it to those who are already back in their employments." He can see the success that the scheme would be when it started. Men already working at something else would begin to look for something better in the way of co-operative enterprise. It is because I am looking for better times for co-operative enterprises, which would remove many of the grievances that we are suffering under to-day, that I favour accepting the amendment of another place. There is huge scope for splendid effort on behalf of the soldiers, and for that reason I shall vote for the amendment.

Senator BARKER (Victoria) [4.16].—I was surprised by Senator Millen's remarks. It is rather amusing to find that in one place the Government agree to a clause being put into a Bill, while in another place the Minister representing the same party, with the same views and aspirations, asks that the clause shall be thrown out of the Bill. Senator Millen advanced the reason that it was almost impracticable because of certain ventures brought under his notice, which, in his opinion, were rotten. He said that those who brought them under his notice so urgently were local people with an axe to grind, who wanted to utilize the Government to finance them, but would not put any capital in themselves. A large number of men have been trained, or are being trained, in various technical schools. There are over 600 going through vocational training at the Working Men's College, with which I have been connected for the last eighteen years. Some of them said to me, "When we have learnt all we can learn we have to seek private employment, or do something else if we cannot get it. Why cannot the Government give us an opportunity to co-operate, for the purpose of establishing industries with the knowledge we have gained, so that we can sell our goods after making them, instead of working for somebody else." A very strong case was put before me in which the men had shown their capabilities. There is every safeguard in this provision, because the Minister, upon advice, would himself determine whether an industry should be established or not. There can be no such thing as men not properly fitted for the work undertaking to form a co-operative society and being able to demand assistance from the Government. I am sure that those in another place who agreed to the clause being put in the Bill saw that that was so. Senator Rowell interjected when Senator Gardiner was speaking, "We do not want to wet-nurse the soldiers all the time." That is a thing that should not be said in this Chamber or outside it.

Senator ROWELL.—I am one of them.

Senator BARKER.—The man who can say it here or elsewhere now dared not say it during war time. He would not have been here to-day. He is unworthy of the position that he holds when he can make such a statement. These men have a right to everything which the Common-

wealth can give them, because of the magnificent work which they did overseas. We have been told that there is nothing too good for them.

Senator MILLEN.—But I question whether this is good for them.

Senator BARKER.—The matter is one which the other branch of the Legislature has decided in the light of just as much information as we ourselves possess. We recognise that these men should be afforded every chance of getting back into civil life. I have in my mind the case of some returned soldiers who would have established a new industry here had they possessed the necessary capital. They applied to the Repatriation Department for assistance, but it was refused them. Had they been supported as they should have been, they would to-day have been producing goods and selling them direct to the public. Are not these men entitled to be trusted? A little while ago they were intrusted with a very great deal more than the few paltry pounds that are involved here. They were then intrusted with the preservation of the liberties of the Empire.

Senator SENIOR.—What changes does time bring round!

Senator BARKER.—The honorable senator can "flapdoodle" now that the war is over. He can approve of the statement that it is not proper to "wet-nurse" our returned soldiers any longer. But here is an amendment which has been sent up to us by another place, and honorable senators opposite intend to knock it out. If it is good enough for the other branch of the Legislature it is good enough for us. I shall vote against the Ministerial proposal.

Senator NEWLAND (South Australia) [4.25].—It is rather amusing—and I am sure it puts the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) in a very peculiar position—to hear honorable senators opposite affirm that we ought blindly to accept whatever amendments the other House may choose to insert in the Bill. This is, indeed, a new rôle for the Leader of the Opposition (Senator Gardiner) and Senator Barker to assume. Upon many occasions they have found very serious fault with the Government for agreeing with the legislative proposals which originated in another place. They have repeatedly urged, when Bills come up here, that the Government expect us to slavishly adhere to the decisions of the

other Chamber. To-day, however, their attitude is of quite a different character. The very circumstance that honorable senators upon this side of the chamber are opposing the insertion of the proposed new clause shows how absolutely inaccurate is Senator Barker's statement. The honorable senator posed as the censor of a gentleman who has taken part in more than one war, merely because he remarked that our soldiers should not be wet-nursed.

Senator MILLEN.—Honorable senators opposite did not say that he had to be wet-nursed before the armistice.

Senator NEWLAND.—Senator Barker now suggests that some influence has been at work in order that we might get behind the Minister in this regard.

Senator BARKER. — The honorable senator is a martyr.

Senator NEWLAND.—I do not pose as a martyr. I am perfectly at liberty to oppose any proposal which may be brought forward by Ministers, and that is a glorious position for any senator to occupy. In assigning reasons why the clause should not be inserted the Minister said that there was a great probability of unworthy enterprises being foisted upon returned soldiers. To vest the Minister with the right of veto in such matters would be to place him in a very unenviable position. He has himself stated that he does not feel competent to decide whether soldiers should be assisted to establish on a co-operative basis such industries as saw-milling and the working of a coal mine. No Minister is competent to decide whether a body of men ought to be assisted to engage in such enterprises. It would be necessary to appoint a board of experts to deal with these matters. We all recognise that individually and collectively soldiers have entered into various businesses since their return to Australia. We know, too, that they have not all been successful. If soldiers who enter into co-operative enterprises are to be permitted to draw upon the Government whenever they sustain a loss, it follows that the Government will always be obliged to see them through their undertakings. Otherwise, it will be said that if the Commonwealth had stood behind them they would have succeeded. Only a few days ago we dealt with another Bill which provided that returned soldiers may start co-operative concerns for themselves. The sol-

diers asked for that consideration, but they have not asked for the proposal which is embodied in this new clause. The War Gratuity Bill provides that the Government will stand behind a returned soldier when he puts his gratuity into a co-operative concern. Parliament has also enacted that nurses, doctors and others may put their allowances for war service homes into co-operative enterprises. I agree with Senator Barker that nothing is too good for our returned soldiers, although he and his friends did not always say that. At the same time, we have a right to see that we do not lead our soldiers into a trap or encourage unscrupulous persons outside to do so. I have no doubt that the Committee will follow the advice of the Minister and reject the clause. From reading the remarks of its author, I know perfectly well what he had in his mind. He had chiefly in view co-operative enterprises associated with primary production. But now it is suggested that these enterprises may cover anything from the purchase of a coal mine to the running of a fleet of ships. Suppose that the Minister had asked for power to purchase half-a-dozen vessels for the purpose of strike-breaking. Would my honorable friends opposite have applauded that proposal?

Senator GARDINER.—That is the kind of thing which you applaud.

Senator NEWLAND.—The honorable senator's statement is absolutely untrue, and he has no right to make it.

Senator GARDINER.—I am in a particularly good humour just now. Come out into the gardens and say that, and I will stuff the lie down your throat.

Senator NEWLAND.—The honorable senator has charged me with assisting strike-breaking. His statement is absolutely contrary to fact. I am as firm a believer in maintaining the rights of the working man as he is, although I do not make so much noise about it. I regret that I have been sidetracked by the interjection of the honorable senator which was offensive to me in the extreme. To-day we are experiencing trouble in the building industry. Suppose that our returned men were to start a co-operative concern for the purpose of building soldiers' homes. Would my friends opposite like that? I believe that sufficient provision has already been made in our legislation to enable our returned soldiers to embark upon any co-operative scheme into which they may desire to enter.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [4.35].—I was rather amused at the outset of the honorable senator's remarks. He appeared to expand his chest and strike an independent attitude. But there are forty-four amendments to the Repatriation Bill, and I find he is so independent that up to the present he has followed the Minister in accepting every one. In regard to this amendment he now tells us that he is opposing its acceptance because he is not bound or shackled to the Minister.

Senator NEWLAND.—You leave my statements alone. I exercise my own judgment.

Senator GARDINER.—The honorable senator got very angry with me because I suggested that he is a strike-breaker, but for the last two years his voice and vote have been against the strikers.

Senator NEWLAND.—That statement is contrary to fact.

Senator GARDINER.—If I had time I could turn up *Hansard* and prove what I am saying. I repeat that in every debate of recent years he has spoken and voted against the strikers. In fact, it has become a habit with him.

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Shannon).—I ask the honorable senator to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Senator GARDINER.—The amendment aims at the establishment of co-operative concerns, in connexion with which there is very little danger of strikes. Senator Newland said that during the war my attitude and that of Senator Barker was totally different from our attitude of to-day, but our attitude is just the same, though by misrepresentation an endeavour has been made to prove it otherwise. But this misrepresentation will not fool the soldiers on a question like this, which asks that co-operative concerns may be established with the consent of the Minister.

Senator MILLEN.—No; the question is whether the Government shall find the money to enable them to start extensive enterprises such as coal mines and other big ventures.

Senator GARDINER.—I mentioned coal mines just as an illustration. I understand there is an almost unlimited demand in Victoria for coal which a co-

operative concern could easily supply. But, of course, the Minister for Repatriation knows the danger of these co-operative concerns.

Senator MILLEN.—I do.

Senator GARDINER.—He knows the danger they constitute to vested interests, to the exploiters and profiteers of this country. The amendment says nothing at all about the Government providing a huge sum of money with which to establish a coal mine or any other enterprise. It merely asks that the Commission shall have power, with the consent of the Minister, to assist soldiers. They may decide to invest some of their gratuity money in these concerns on a co-operative basis, and the Minister, by moving to disagree with the House of Representatives' amendment, wants to refuse them this assistance. Of course, this is the policy of his party. They won the election on it. It is the policy of the people who were opposed to all co-operative enterprises calculated to injure, in any way, those who are associated with private concerns and Combinations that are supporting this Government and members on the Ministerial benches. Naturally they want no co-operative enterprises to interfere with their businesses. Let us, however, imagine the establishment of a co-operative shipping enterprise trading between Tasmania and the mainland. Is it likely that men engaged in such a business would strike against themselves? How many ships would they require to maintain regular communication between Tasmania and the mainland? And then, if they were successful, they could go further afield and establish communication with New Zealand. There is, in fact, almost unlimited scope for a well organized co-operative shipping concern.

Senator GUTHRIE.—We had a co-operative shipping business in New Zealand once, and it ruined us.

Senator GARDINER.—But of late years we have gained a lot of experience in co-operation, and we now have an excellent opportunity to encourage our returned soldiers to enter this field. I congratulate honorable members of another place upon having inserted this provision in the Bill, as the amendment

is calculated to materially benefit, not only our returned soldiers, but the whole community; though I can quite understand why the Minister should oppose it. He has always been the representative of the big institutions and the big Combines of this country.

Senator HENDERSON (Western Australia) [4.44].—This is a phase of co-operation with which I have had no experience. All my life I have been connected with co-operative enterprises. I can quite understand any body of men advocating Government control of these concerns; but I do not know whether this would be a wise policy. I cannot see how we could justify our action, by voting for the amendment made by the House of Representatives, asking the Government to find money which some other people would have the right to spend as they think fit. The principle of co-operation has been in operation for the better part of a century, and very many such institutions may be numbered as amongst the most successful enterprises in the civilized world. But I point out that the money invested in them belongs to those who are actively associated with such concerns. I am not so sure that they would be as successful if the money provided were spent by somebody else in a haphazard manner, as might happen under this amendment. In my opinion, the Government are doing almost everything that is humanly possible for our returned soldiers, and they should not now be asked to find money for co-operative concerns, as contemplated in the amendment, because ventures of this kind are bound to fail, owing to the absence of that incentive to success, namely, the investment in them of one's own capital. In this case, the money will be simply doled out by the Government to people who would experiment with it. Co-operation, if it means anything, means the co-operation of the whole. If a man wants to be co-operator, he must be prepared to co-operate with that which he possesses. Unless a man's interests are definitely associated with these enterprises, he cannot argue very forcibly in favour of them, nor will he be very successful in the business. The co-operative societies established in New South Wales have, for the most part, been

very successful. But some have failed. Practically the whole of the co-operative undertakings, with the exception of those in Western Australia, where the members of certain timber concerns took the opportunity of selling out when they had a suitable opportunity, have failed. Those in operation in Western Australia were, however, successful; and if we desire the soldiers to succeed we should allow them to work out their own salvation under the provision embodied in the War Gratuity Bill. If they are anxious to conduct businesses, all they need do is to co-operate, pool their gratuities, and follow in the footsteps of our successful pioneers. During their travels abroad many of our soldiers must have had an opportunity of inspecting the industrial undertakings which, in times of peace, were hives of industry, but which, during the war period, unfortunately were at a standstill. Industries of this kind have been, and are still being, successfully handled by men whose life interests are sunk in them, and whose capital has been the means of building them up. I therefore intend supporting the Minister in opposing this amendment, because if the soldiers are prepared to work on a co-operative basis they have the opportunity of doing so under the provisions of the War Gratuity Bill.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [4.53].—Honorable senators have apparently overlooked the fact that no machinery is provided in the Bill for giving effect to the proposed new clause. If the amendment is agreed to we shall be enacting something entirely foreign to the spirit of the measure. This is not a Bill in which such a clause should be inserted, and if we adopt it we shall be making a grave mistake. Provision has already been made in the War Gratuity Bill for something of this character, and the authorities responsible for the administration of that Act will have the opportunity of giving their careful attention to that portion of the measure. But under a Repatriation Bill it is unreasonable to give the Commissioners power to control, or even direct, a number of undertakings; and if the proposal is adopted it will certainly lead to considerable inconvenience and probably disorganization.

I am sorry Senator Barker is not present, as I would like to remind him that it is now April, 1920, and we can look back and realize that in this month, two years ago, these gentlemen opposite did not then act in the way they are acting to-day. Here in this city, and in the city from which Senator Gardiner comes, action was taken that was entirely antagonistic to the principle now advocated. Do honorable senators opposite recall that it was in April, 1918, when Haig delivered his celebrated message to the effect that our men had their backs to the wall, and that no man should give way? Who was it who then applauded the soldier? Who were the members of organizations that supported resolutions to the effect that there was no possibility of victory for the Allies, and that Great Britain should retire from the conflict?

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Shannon).—Order! The honorable senator is not discussing the clause.

Senator SENIOR.—I think I am in order in answering some of the charges that have been made against honorable senators on this side.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable senator is not in order at this stage in discussing the attitude of a political party.

Senator SENIOR.—I am complaining of the statements made by honorable senators opposite; and I wish to place on record the fact that those who now profess to be the friends of the soldiers were not their friends in April, 1918. They are trying to establish the point that if we vote against the proposed new clause we are not the friends of the soldiers; but it must be remembered that in a time of national stress and trial we proved that we were their friends.

Senator GARDINER.—If sheer humbug will prove anything the honorable senator will do it.

Senator SENIOR.—If I am permitted, I shall quote from a report of the proceedings of the Sydney Labour Council in May, 1918, when the members of that body opposed a resolution—101 votes to 74—that had been carried at the Governor-General's Conference, in favour of uniting in a recruiting campaign.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable senator is not discussing the question before the Chair.

Senator GARDINER.—I suppose Senator Senior is quoting from a capitalistic paper, from information prepared and supplied merely for the use of his party.

Senator SENIOR.—I wish to place it on record, because we have been charged with not desiring to assist the soldiers. I must reply to that charge.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable senator is not in order in discussing recruiting, as that question is not before the Committee.

Senator SENIOR.—Honorable senators on this side have been charged with acting in an unfriendly way towards the soldiers, because we are not supporting the insertion of the proposed new clause. It has been said that we are devoid of sincerity. Can honorable senators opposite say that they are sincere in their desire to assist the soldiers, when they have refused to assist the recruiting movement, at a time when the Germans were within 40 miles of Paris? Where were honorable senators then? It was at that critical stage in our history that they said that victory was impossible. We said that victory was possible, and we stood by the soldiers then and have done so ever since. But, because we do not favour the insertion of the proposed clause, it does not prove that we are not desirous of assisting our fighting men. We have always been the friend of the soldiers, but I decline to assist in including this clause in the Bill, because I do not think it is its proper place. However, if it is included, no machinery has been provided for giving effect to it. If such a provision is necessary, why not introduce a separate Bill to enable soldiers to start co-operative concerns. Such a provision should not be inserted in a Repatriation Bill, when the money has to be found by the Government and not by the soldier, and there is a vast difference between using public money and money belonging to the soldiers. If a separate Bill were submitted, there would be more strength in Senator Gardiner's arguments in asking the Government to assist. This is not a question of assisting, but of doing everything, which is quite a different proposition. We are charged with being fettered—

Senator GARDINER.—You told us, quite recently, that your speeches were based on a publication entitled *Weekly Notes*.

Senator SENIOR.—Does the honorable senator suggest that the quotation I read was untruthful? Does he say that the records of the Labour Council are untrue? Surely there cannot be anything wrong in quoting from a truthful record!

The CHAIRMAN.—Conversations of this character across the chamber are distinctly out of order.

Senator SENIOR.—Senator Gardiner is responsible for this discussion, and it is grossly unfair and incorrect to say that honorable senators on this side are unfriendly towards the soldier. Honorable senators opposite and their supporters deserted our men in the darkest hour of our history. As there is no provision in the Bill for giving effect to the proposed clause, it is my intention to oppose the amendment.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [5.2].—I feel it is my duty to reply to the attack that has been made on my party by Senator Senior. So far as words go, I do not think I have ever accused the honorable senator of being unfriendly towards the soldier. He has been continually repeating the fact that he is the soldiers' friend for three years, but when an opportunity comes for him to do anything he always shirks his responsibility. The honorable senator has been endeavouring to prove, by reading quotations, that the record of our party is altogether unfavorable, but he must remember that we were responsible for passing legislation that has been of great advantage to our soldiers. We are now asking the Government to go further and do something in the interests of a few soldiers. This clause merely provides that assistance shall be given in certain directions, if the Minister approves, and these so-called friends of the soldiers are opposing it. If the Minister is willing to approve of assistance being given in this direction, why should the Committee object?

Senator HENDERSON.—Who finds the money?

Senator GARDINER.—There are hundreds of ways of assisting without finding money. For the last two years more money has been wasted—I use the term advisedly—in repatriation work than

would have been required to finance a dozen co-operative concerns. It runs into thousands of pounds sterling per week.

Senator DE LARGIE.—Ask the men if the money has been wasted.

Senator GARDINER.—It is remarkable how honorable senators opposite disregard past occurrences and how they carefully endeavour to prevent things happening in the future. The way the Repatriation Department has been conducted has been costing the country thousands of pounds per week.

Senator MILLEN.—Co-operation would not have affected that.

Senator GARDINER.—If they established co-operative concerns they would be so profitable that the men would get away from the Repatriation Department altogether.

Senator MILLEN.—Does the honorable senator suggest that the co-operative concerns would be profitable at once?

Senator GARDINER.—They would become profitable almost as soon as they were started, and would give employment.

Senator MILLEN.—Could they be started at once?

Senator GARDINER.—They could be started without any delay. Half-a-dozen men would soon start a co-operative business if they could be assured that they would be assisted—I do not say with moneys of the Repatriation Department, but with their own moneys—and once they got together they could go on with their co-operative concern. Honorable senators will say that they could do this without this clause, and while that is true, they could do it very much better with the advantage of this clause. They could do it so much better that honorable members in another place said that the provision should be inserted in this Bill, and they gave the Minister for Repatriation the right to refuse or to accept any proposal made under it. I am satisfied that if any proposition was submitted in connexion with which returned soldiers were likely to lose money the Minister would not agree to it. If any particular proposal could not be shown to be on a sound business footing it would be immediately turned down. We are asked to insert a provision which can be taken advantage of only on the initiative of the soldiers themselves.

Honorable senators opposite refuse to agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, and yet Senators Senior and Newland stand up and parade their support of the returned soldiers. I say that so far as their professions of support are concerned I have to accept them, because I have heard them say a hundred times that they are interested and enthusiastic supporters of the returned soldiers. But I am forced to a different opinion of them when I find them refusing to agree to any proposal that would benefit the returned soldiers. I know their professions as to what they did when the war was on, and what somebody else did not do, and what they thought of persons who spoke in a way that did not please them.

Senator NEWLAND.—The verdict of the soldiers is a very satisfactory one, I may tell the honorable senator.

Senator GARDINER.—I hope that Senator Newland is well satisfied with it, and particularly satisfied with the way we were permitted to carry on the war and finish it. We have secured the peace which the party opposite said they fought for, and they have got everything they wanted.

Senator NEWLAND.—I am afraid not.

Senator GARDINER.—The party opposite were going to win the war; they were kept in power for the purpose. What more do they want? And yet Senator Newland says that he is afraid they have not got what they wanted.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—We won the war right enough.

Senator GARDINER.—Unquestionably; but I am not quite sure whether it was Senator Fairbairn or Senator Senior who won the war.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—It was not Senator Gardiner, anyway.

Senator GARDINER.—I am quite sure it was not, but I do not mind putting my record against that of Senator Newland and taking his judgment upon it. Here we are considering not what honorable senators did in the past, but what they are prepared to do to-day, and we find that honorable senators opposite are not prepared to do anything but live on their record as the old "has-beens" who won the war.

Senator MILLEN.—The honorable senator would not call the members of this party the "has-beens" after the last elections?

Senator GARDINER.—No; honorable senators are the "its," but still the fact remains that whilst before the elections they had a majority of fifty-four, the Government now lives by the grace of the members of two other parties in Parliament. So far as the party on this side is concerned we increased our numbers in the House that makes and unmakes Governments, whilst the party opposite is dependent for their majority on the Country party or the Labour party, and cannot carry on without that assistance.

Senator NEWLAND.—Where is the honorable senator's party in the Senate?

Senator GARDINER.—The members of our party were cheated out of their positions here by an Act which swindled them out of the right to have the votes recorded for them counted. In the last two elections there was not a difference of 2,000 votes between Senator McDougall and myself, but at the last election, because all the votes counted were not recorded, there was a difference of 100,000 votes between us. Every one knows that that is not a true index of the way in which the people voted. If all the votes recorded for Senator McDougall were counted, it is possible that he would be here instead of myself.

Senator NEWLAND.—And a very good thing, too.

Senator GARDINER.—I realize that it would be quite a good thing for the country and for every one else, but honorable senators opposite can take very little credit for having passed a Bill which swindled Senator McDougall out of his job. The House of Representatives has proposed the insertion of the provision which can only be brought into force on the initiative of the soldiers, and which is controlled by the Minister for Repatriation. I shall certainly call for a division on the amendment, and will let the matter go now without further discussion.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 48—

(1) The Minister may, on the recommendation of the Commission, appoint Local Committees within a State or Territory.

(2) The persons to be appointed as members of a Local Committee shall be selected in the prescribed manner.

(3) Subject to the regulations, a Local Committee shall have power to raise and control

funds for the district for which they are appointed and to disburse those funds within that district for the granting of assistance and benefits to any of the classes of persons specified in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the last preceding section or to any relative or person not specified in paragraphs (b), (c), or (d) of that section who was dependent upon any deceased or discharged Australian soldier prior to his enlistment or for any other purpose prescribed by the regulations.

(4) A Local Committee shall have such other powers as are prescribed.

(5) Members of a Local Committee shall hold office during the pleasure of the Minister.

(6) Any Local Committee appointed under the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Act, 1917-1918 shall, subject to the approval of the Minister, continue as if appointed under this Act.

(7) The executive of a Local Committee may exercise such of the powers of the Committee as are prescribed.

House of Representatives' Amendments.—Omit "Minister may on the recommendation of the Commission", insert "Commission may".

After sub-clause 4 insert the following sub-clauses:—

"(4A) The Commission shall appoint, for each Local Committee, an executive consisting of seven members of the Committee.

(4B) Five members of the executive of each Local Committee shall be nominated by the Committee, and two members shall be selected by the Commission."

Omit "shall hold office during the pleasure of the Minister", insert "and of the executive of a Local Committee shall hold office during the pleasure of the Commission".

Omit "shall, subject to the approval of the Minister," insert "and the executive of any such Local Committee shall".

Omit "may exercise such of the powers of the Committee as are prescribed", insert "shall have and may exercise—

(a) such of the powers of the Committee as are prescribed, and

(b) such other powers as are prescribed:

Provided that, in the exercise of any powers conferred in pursuance of paragraph (b) of this sub-section, the executive shall be responsible only to the Commission."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.12].—All these amendments relate to the same matter. The Bill as it left the Senate left Local Committees, as under the existing law, to be appointed by the Minister. It is proposed by the House of Representatives, in conformity with the general scope of the Bill, to make these dependent upon the Commission. The duties of the executives of the Committees are set out, and makes their appointment dependent

upon the Commission instead of the Minister. I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

House of Representatives' Amendments.—Insert the following clauses:—

"56A. The Commission shall furnish to the Minister annually for presentation to Parliament a report of the administration and operation of this Act.

56B. Where, prior to the passing of this Act, a local fund for the repatriation of Australian soldiers has been raised in any district, the control of that fund shall, subject to the regulations, be vested in the trustees for the time being of the fund."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.14].—The House of Representatives have further amended the Bill by inserting new clauses 56A and 56B. A counterpart to these provisions appears in the existing Act, but by some oversight was not included in the Bill now under consideration when it was introduced. The proposed new provisions are self-explanatory, and I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 57 (Regulations)—

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After "mothers" insert "or stepmothers." Omit "widows and were prior to the enlistment of those soldiers dependent upon them" insert "either widowed, divorced or deserted". Omit "and". Omit "or stepmothers". After sub-paragraph (v) of paragraph (d) insert the following sub-paragraph:—

"(vi) any person who was, prior to the death of an Australian soldier, recognised as his wife although not legally married to him."

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.16].—These are amendments in conformity with a series of amendments to which the Committee has already agreed. They provide for the inclusion in these benefits of stepmothers, widowed, divorced, or deserted wives, and of women recognised as wives although not legally married to the deceased soldier. I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

First Schedule—

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After "payable" insert "subject to the provisions of the third schedule."

Senator **MILLEN** (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.17].—In this amendment, the House of Representatives proposes, in the third line of the First Schedule, to insert the words “subject to the provisions of the Third Schedule.” The intention is to connect the First Schedule with the payments provided for in the Third Schedule. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Second Schedule—

House of Representatives' Amendment.—After the first paragraph insert the following paragraphs:—

“The Commission may grant a pension not exceeding the special rate of pension to any person, or any member of the Forces, who is suffering from tuberculosis, and who has been, for at least six months, an inmate of an establishment for persons so suffering, and has been discharged from that establishment:

Provided that this paragraph shall not authorize the grant of a pension to such member of the Forces unless, upon his discharge from the establishment, the medical officer in charge of that establishment has certified that such discharge is not a menace to public health.”

Senator **MILLEN** (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.18].—The Second Schedule provides for the payment of a special pension to blinded and totally and permanently incapacitated men, and it is proposed, by the insertion of these new paragraphs, to include amongst those entitled to the special rate of pension members of the Forces suffering from tuberculosis. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Third Schedule—

House of Representatives' Amendments.—After the item “widowed mother of an unmarried member” insert the following item:—

“Widowed or unmarried mother of an unmarried member who was born out of wedlock, and who was brought up by her: the rate specified in column 2 of the First Schedule, provided that, in the case of a widow, she became a widow, either prior to, or within three years after, the death of the member.”

Senator **MILLEN** (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.19].—This is consequent upon amendments already adopted, and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Fourth Schedule—

House of Representatives' Amendments.—Omit all the words after “disability (second occurring)” and insert—

Description of Disability.	Rate of Permanent Pension payable. Percentage of rate in column 4 in First Schedule opposite Member's Rate of Pay.
	Per centum.
Loss of two or more limbs ..	100
Loss of both eyes ..	100
Loss of one eye, together with loss of leg, foot, hand or arm ..	100
Loss of both arms ..	100
Loss of both legs ..	100
Loss of both feet ..	100
Loss of both hands ..	100
Loss of hand and foot ..	100
Loss of all fingers and thumbs ..	100
Lunacy ..	100
Wounds, injuries, or disease, involving total permanent disabling effects ..	100
Very severe facial disfigurement ..	100
Amputation of leg at hip, or of right arm at shoulder joint (if right-handed), or of left arm at shoulder joint (if left handed) ..	100 for first six months 80 thereafter
Severe facial disfigurement ..	80
Total loss of speech ..	80
Loss of leg or foot ..	100 for first six months 75 thereafter
Loss of arm or hand ..	100 for first six months 75 thereafter
Total deafness ..	70
Loss of vision in one eye ..	50

For the purposes of this Schedule, a leg, foot, hand arm or eye is deemed to be lost if it is rendered permanently and wholly useless.

Senator **MILLEN** (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [5.20].—Under the Fourth Schedule, it is provided that—

Any member of the Forces who is incapacitated by reason of a disability specified in the first column of this Schedule, shall receive the rate of pension shown in the second column of this Schedule opposite the description of the disability.

The amendment made by the House of Representatives does not, in effect, alter the Schedule under the existing law, but sets out the various degrees of disability in greater particularity. The Schedule adopted by the British Parliament deals with a vast number of forms, in which men are maimed, and provides a special

rate for each. The practice adopted here is to group the forms of disability under certain main headings. This is thought desirable, and the soldiers themselves prefer to have the injury set out with the special rate of pension payable in respect thereof. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Reported that the Committee had agreed to the amendments with the exception of Nos. 4 and 30, to which they disagreed.

Report adopted.

Motion (by Senator MILLEN) agreed to—

That a Committee, consisting of Senators Earle, Newland, and the mover, be appointed to prepare and bring up reasons for disagreeing to certain of the amendments of the House of Representatives.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

Report adopted.

PASSPORTS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 28th April (*vide* page 1518), on motion by Senator RUSSELL)—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [5.21].—This is another piece of that finicky legislation introduced by the Government which exercised under the War Precautions Act powers which the War Precautions Act never conceded to them, but which they assumed to themselves. I look upon this measure as one of the small things that do not matter much. While a Government like this is in office, it scarcely matters whether it has taken power by legislation or whether it exercises it at its own discretion. The system of passports proposed in this Bill appears to me to be simply an attempt to interfere with the travelling community, and to harass and annoy people as much as possible by insisting that they shall come to a Government Department before they may have permission to leave this country. There are quite a number of people that I would hurry out of Australia without making them ask for permission to leave. I think we will have a quorum. [*Quorum formed.*] This is merely part and parcel

of the sort of legislation of which the Government seem so fond, costing a good deal to administer, adding considerably to the irritation of the community, and benefiting no one in particular. For years one could leave this country without a passport. If the Government wish to regulate the travelling community by means of passports, they should see that there is no difficulty in getting them. Sydney is the chief city of Australia, easily first in wealth, population and importance, yet a citizen of Sydney who wants to travel has to wait until Melbourne is communicated with. A Bill which continues such a system is not worthy of the consideration of the Senate. We can get on very well without all this class of legislation. It is not satisfactory, and it stops no one going outside this country who really wants to go. If I desire to get out of Australasia without a passport I can do so. We have had cases where men have gone without passports, and also other cases where passports have been issued very expeditiously, even when the Government did not want them to be issued. The Bill is in accord with the legislation for which the Government are becoming famous or infamous; legislation that aims at interfering with private persons, legislation that wants to bring everything under the control of Departments, and enable the Government to interfere by one means or another where Government interference is of no value and no benefit. As this Bill is part and parcel of that sort of thing, I will not detain honorable senators by discussing it. The Government have introduced it, and can pass it, as I have no doubt they will. I shall call for a division against it.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [5.27].—Senator Gardiner is evidently under a misapprehension as to the objects of the Bill. He says people can leave Australia without passports. That is quite true, but they cannot get into other countries without passports. This is a Bill to facilitate travelling. All sorts of people are exempt, such, for instance, as any member of the Naval or Military Forces leaving the Commonwealth on duty, any member of the crew of an over-sea vessel, any member of the crew of any vessel who signs on in Australia for

an oversea voyage, any person visiting New Zealand, or returning to New Zealand, Papua, Norfolk Island, &c. On other people there is no restriction beyond the securing of a simple passport prior to leaving the Commonwealth. That document will facilitate travelling in other parts of the world. Senator Gardiner might be able to obtain facilities for travelling when he reached England, but it would be foolish to permit people to leave Australia for other parts of the world, as probably thousands will be doing shortly, to see the graves of their boys or for other purposes, without taking with them from Australia a certificate that they are reputable citizens of Australia.

Senator GARDINER.—One gentleman who wanted to go from New South Wales some time ago for health reasons could not get a passport.

Senator MILLEN.—What was his name?

Senator GARDINER.—Georgeson,

Senator RUSSELL.—There is no restriction on anybody's liberty, but the passport has been made essential not by any action we have taken, but by action taken in practically every other country in the world.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 (Persons leaving the Commonwealth to have passports bearing proper visé).

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [5.30].—I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to a case that arose some time ago in connexion with the issue of a passport, and to ask him for some assurance that what happened then is not going to be the practice of the Department. In that case the passport was applied for and granted, and the person who received it travelled as far as Fremantle. Then, on account of certain private circumstances that arose, the Department cancelled the passport, and the holder was pulled off the boat and left at Fremantle. On account of the delicacy of the case I shall not quote any names; but is it the intention of the Government, having once satisfied themselves of the *bona fides* of an applicant, and issued a passport, if circumstances arise which are altogether outside of

Government concern, to use their powers in that way?

Senator RUSSELL.—Cannot you give the reasons?

Senator FOLL.—The person concerned was a lady who was travelling to England in the company of a certain gentleman, as I understand, at his expense. Have the Government determined by means of their power to issue passports to constitute themselves the controller of the morals of everybody who travels overseas?

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [5.32].—Probably we have heard only part of the story. I have heard of cases of ladies applying for passports under assumed names. Any governmental document secured by fraud or misrepresentation ought to be cancelled, and there is power in this Bill to do so.

Senator FOLL.—Even after they have left the port?

Senator RUSSELL.—Yes; we have a right to cancel any instrument of government obtained by fraudulent means and intended for use in another country.

Senator KEATING (Tasmania) [5.33].—This clause imposes on all persons leaving the Commonwealth, with specified exceptions, the obligation to secure passports. Senator Gardiner referred to a matter regarding which I should like to have further information from the Minister. Is it unavoidable that the passport administration should be centralized in Melbourne? I know instances where people from Tasmania desired to travel beyond the Commonwealth. Their port of embarkation from the Commonwealth was Sydney, as they were going across the Pacific or northward to ports in Asia. Before they could get their passports they had to be in Sydney. I know cases where they left Tasmania, and were due to arrive in Sydney a little before the oversea boat was to leave, and the interval between their arrival and proposed departure was a holiday. It is very inconvenient for well-known and reputable inhabitants of Hobart to find themselves unable to get their passport because the office in Sydney is closed. Could not some arrangement be made whereby in the different States those intending to travel could get their passports before they left their regular home? It will be most awkward if people have to come from Western Australia or

Queensland to Sydney or Melbourne as their port of embarkation overseas, and to find that they have to depend upon eventualities and contingencies in Melbourne or Sydney as to whether they can get their passports or not. Some arrangement might very well be made whereby intending travellers, before leaving their homes, should be given an assurance that they will receive their passports in due course. In one case that I have in my mind, an intending traveller was apprised of the possibility that upon his arrival in Sydney he would be unable to obtain his passport. He communicated with me, and I suggested to the authorities here that the passport might be issued and forwarded to him in Tasmania through certain Commonwealth officers. The authorities found themselves unable to adopt my suggestion, but consented to make special arrangements to meet this particular case. I do not know what would have happened to this traveller had he not taken the precaution to communicate with me prior to leaving his home in Tasmania. If we are going to impose upon the public the obligation to obtain passports we should certainly facilitate the issue of those passports, and we ought not to compel intending travellers to visit a particular centre with no assurance that upon their arrival there they will receive them.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [5.37].—I agree with Senator Keating that the best possible facilities should be available to the travelling public in the matter of obtaining passports. The trouble which has been outlined by the honorable senator was due to special circumstances. During the war period the Intelligence Department was centralized at the Defence Headquarters in Melbourne. But under this Bill it is intended to vest in the Customs Officers of each State full authority to administer it under a civil Department instead of as part of a military organization.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [5.39].—Under this Bill a departmental officer will be clothed with altogether too much power. One clause in it seeks to authorize him to cancel a passport which has been issued. I have been called upon quite a number of times to intervene in order to enable intending

travellers to get away by certain over-sea vessels. That sort of thing ought not to obtain. The humblest citizen of the Commonwealth is either entitled to a passport or he is not. If a passport will not be issued to him, it is undesirable that a member of Parliament should be called upon to exert his influence to enable him to get it. I have no complaint against the departmental officers as such. I have always found them extremely obliging and willing to assist travellers in every possible way. But I object to the system which the Bill seeks to introduce. The Government are introducing measure after measure in which provision is made to clothe different persons with powers which they ought not to be permitted to exercise. Yet no protest is made. Of course, a Justice of the High Court will protest when he sees the Government attempting to set aside the Arbitration Court in favour of a Commission, which has yet to be constituted. But nobody else protests. This tendency to concentrate power in the hands of individuals is a vicious one, which requires to be checked.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6—

A passport or permit or pass to leave the Commonwealth, issued by or under the authority of the Government of the Commonwealth, may be cancelled by the permanent head of the Department controlling the issue of passports, or by some person thereto authorized by him, and the passport, permit or pass, as the case may be, shall thereupon be void.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [5.42].—To my mind, this clause goes a long way too far. I object to empowering a Government officer or some person authorized by him to step on board a vessel just as she is about to depart from port, and to say to a passenger, "You cannot proceed on your voyage because your passport has been cancelled." Probably, I shall be told by the Minister that this power will be used with very great discretion. Such powers always are. But I am not disposed to acquiesce in any legislation which will confer such far-reaching power on any Commonwealth officer.

Senator ROWELL.—No officer would use this power without very grave reason.

Senator GARDINER.—If honorable senators are prepared to accept that explanation, why not appoint officers with

power to do anything? What if the head of the Government issued a passport to a particular individual, and a departmental officer who imagined that he had not received from the intending passenger that degree of respect to which he thought himself entitled took it upon himself to cancel the passport? The whole position is full of danger. I have nothing to urge against departmental officers, but I do object to giving them powers the exercise of which may considerably embarrass the travelling public.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [5.45].—I appreciate the point which has been raised by Senator Gardiner. Under this clause there is nothing to prevent a passport from being cancelled without sufficient reason, with the result that grave loss and inconvenience may be sustained by an intending traveller. Seeing that a fair time must elapse between the period when a passport is applied for and the departure of the vessel by which the applicant will travel, surely there is ample opportunity for the Department to conduct the necessary inquiries. I am quite in sympathy with the action taken by the Government in the case to which I previously referred, and I merely desired to obtain from the Minister an authoritative statement as to the principle which is followed.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [5.46].—To me it seems strange that it should be suggested that the Commonwealth should not have power to cancel a passport which has been obtained by means of false representations. Suppose, for example, that a warrant has been issued for the arrest of a man who, under an assumed name, has obtained a passport and is fleeing from the Commonwealth. Ought we not to possess the power to cancel his passport? I admit that if this provision were applied to the ordinary citizen, it would operate harshly. But no honest man has anything to fear from legislation of this kind. The power conferred by the clause is not likely to be abused. Tricks are frequently played by travellers by means of an exchange of passports, and the clause is intended to prevent that sort of thing.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [5.48].—I object to vesting in Government officers powers which should be wielded only by Courts of Justice. This clause seeks to clothe Government

officials with power to cancel passports without setting forth the conditions under which the power shall be exercised. If it provided that the passport of a person who had obtained it by means of misrepresentation could be cancelled, I would not object. If any responsible officer exercised the power or cancellation under such circumstances, the individual concerned would have no claim against him. But if an officer compelled a passenger to leave a vessel just as she was about to depart from an Australian port, and thus held him up to public ridicule, that officer could go into Court and plead this clause as a justification for his conduct. I quite agree with the necessity for dealing with persons who have obtained passports by means of fraud or misrepresentation, but I would deal with them by law. Unless there are legal grounds for action, the Government have no right to interfere with them.

Senator PEARCE.—We do not interfere with them. We merely say "We will not issue you a passport, because you have made a false statement."

Senator GARDINER.—There is nothing in this clause about passports being obtained under false pretences. It simply provides that a passport may be cancelled by the permanent head of the Department, or by some person authorized by him.

Senator FOLL.—How did they get on before the war with regard to passports?

Senator GARDINER.—Very well.

Senator PEARCE.—Because other countries did not require them then.

Senator GARDINER.—Why should any officer be given power to cancel a passport issued under the authority of the Government? Departmental officers, of course, would not use this power indiscriminately, but it may be used unwisely on some occasion. And Senator Foll has instanced one of wrongful identity.

Senator EARLE.—The authorities were quite right in exercising power in the case mentioned by Senator Foll.

Senator GARDINER.—But Senator Foll quoted a case of mistaken identity, in which a departmental officer would have authority to cancel a permit. Surely the Government are not going to issue permits which may be cancelled by a subordinate! Let me remind honorable senators of what happened in the case

of Georgeson, who was ill, and, acting on medical advice, applied for a passport to go to New Zealand, where he could get beneficial treatment for his particular ailment. The Federal Government, in no way concerned with the legal aspects of the case—because there was no charge against the man—declined to issue a permit. That was an outrage. They may claim, of course, that public opinion will be with them; but in certain circumstances I would not care very much about public opinion. If a man is at liberty, and has no charges pending against him, it is wrong in principle to interfere with his liberty in any way.

Senator RUSSELL.—Did not the Judge say that he could not give a verdict until he could get evidence from this man?

Senator GARDINER.—A Royal Commission was appointed to make the inquiry, and the Commissioner indicated that he could not come to a final decision until he had obtained evidence from Georgeson. But there was no statement about suspicion, nor was there any doubt about the man's physical condition. I do not know if the Government were requested to withhold a permit from Georgeson, but he was not able to get one, and, therefore, could not leave Australia. If there was any suspicion against a man I could understand the Government taking this precaution; but I object to power being vested in any one to interfere with the liberty of any person against whom there is no charge. I stand for the liberty of the individual, and regret to notice a gradual invasion of this principle in recent legislation. If action is to be taken against any person, the proper legal course should be followed; and if there is a desire to prevent his departure from the Commonwealth, the necessary bail should be asked for.

Senator RUSSELL.—Suppose a man suspected of murder attempted to get away from Australia. He could be arrested at Fremantle or any other port on suspicion, and his permit cancelled. This is done every day. Of course, he would have the benefit of a trial eventually.

Senator GARDINER.—And that is the point which I would like the Minister to look into more closely. When action is taken against any man, a certain amount of hardship is unavoidable; but

in the case cited by the Minister, the man concerned would be in the happy position of knowing that he would come before a Court of law for trial. The position under this clause is different. If, for instance, I joined a vessel in Sydney for Ceylon, and something happened, a departmental officer would have authority, in the presence of all the passengers, to take my passport from me, and I would have no redress. I would be practically "drummed" off the ship in full view of everybody, and degraded before the whole community. It is an entirely wrong principle to give any person authority to interfere with passports issued by the Government, and so I shall oppose the clause.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [6.2].—When the Bill was introduced, honorable senators were assured that its purpose was to facilitate passengers who wished to travel to other countries. In view of that fact, I fail to see the necessity to make inquiries in connexion with the issue of passports, seeing that they are to be issued merely to enable travellers to enter other countries.

Senator EARLE.—If the honorable senator gave some person a credential, he would not like to know afterwards that it was obtained by forgery.

Senator FOLL.—That I think is a weak argument in support of the clause. In the past, whenever people "wanted" by the police attempted to get away from this country, they have been stopped at the wharfs, or some other port of the Commonwealth, and, owing to the vigilance of the police authorities, very few have been able to get away.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [6.3].—I am afraid Senator Foll has not given very close attention to the clause. The authority to cancel is limited to a head of a Department, who is in pretty close touch with the Minister, but action may be taken under instructions by an officer at Fremantle, in North Queensland, or some other distant port of the Commonwealth. The law will always be open to abuse provided people are prepared to take the responsibility of their actions. I draw attention to the exemption provisions of the measure. It is provided that—

If the Minister notifies, by notice in the *Gazette*, that an arrangement has been made with the Government of any country under

which persons, who are British subjects or are subjects or citizens of that country, are not, when proceeding from the Commonwealth to that country, required to be in possession of passports, the provisions of sub-section (1) of the last preceding section shall, so long as the notice continues in force, not apply to British subjects, or the subjects or citizens of that country, when travelling direct from the Commonwealth to that country.

It is our desire to make mutual arrangements between Australia and Great Britain, and if passengers to Great Britain desire to visit some other country a passport issued in Australia will be of considerable value. During the next ten years it will be of very little use for a tourist to travel in Europe without a passport. Honorable senators are familiar with cases where persons have endeavoured to leave Australia with other people's money.

Senator FOLL.—Cannot the police stop such persons?

Senator RUSSELL.—Not if we permit them to leave on a vessel. If we cancel their passports they will be brought to justice. I can recall twenty or thirty instances where men who were supposed to have had good reputations have left Australia but were compelled to return from foreign countries to fulfil their obligations in Australia. I have known managers of banking institutions and the principal officers of building societies to abscond with trust moneys, and as they were well-known persons they were always granted a passport.

Senator FOLL.—What if they have left the last port of call?

Senator RUSSELL.—We would be helpless in the matter. If they had not reached the last port of call in Australia they could be recalled by wireless. When once an absconding debtor, for instance, is beyond the 3-mile limit, we have no control over him. The provisions of this Bill will not affect the ordinary citizen, and it will be a means of protecting innocent persons. If certain persons propose leaving Australia when they have no right to do so, we have under this Bill the power to withhold or cancel their passports and compel them to submit to a proper trial.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 10 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

AUSTRALIAN SOLDIERS' REPATRIATION BILL.

Senator MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [6.11].—I now bring up the reasons prepared by the Committee appointed in reference to the action of the Senate in disagreeing to the suggested amendments, Nos. 4 and 30, made by the House of Representatives in the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill. They are as follows:—

As to amendment No. 4.—Because the term of three years is calculated to restrict the Government's choice in the matter of appointments to the Commission, and that, furthermore, it is not sufficiently long to secure continuity in administration, and a desirable independence of action on the part of the Commissioners.

As to amendment No. 30.—

Because it is not considered equitable to extend to collective bodies of soldiers benefits for which individual soldiers might not be eligible.

Because the effect of the granting of the benefits contemplated by the amendment would result in the unsettlement of the large majority of men whose re-establishment in civil life has already been accomplished.

Because grave financial loss to the Government, and disappointment to bodies of men may result from the starting of enterprises which may not prove successful.

Because if it is desirable to promote enterprises by means of Government advances, the proposals should be the subject of special legislation in which provision would be made for the creation of the proper machinery to give effect to such policy.

I move—

That the reasons be adopted.

Senator GARDINER (New South Wales) [6.12].—I am wondering whether we ought to agree to the reasons submitted by the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen). Honorable senators opposite, of course, agree; but objections from those on this side should be recorded. When a Royal Commission submits its report, Commissioners dissenting are permitted to record their objections, and I think honorable senators on this side should be permitted to do so in this instance. Personally, I think the objections are enlarged somewhat unduly, and could have been submitted in a more concise manner. I therefore content myself by protesting against them as being unsound, hurriedly drawn up, ill-considered, and of very little use when submitted to the giants in another place.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Senate adjourned at 6.14.

House of Representatives.

Thursday, 29 April, 1920.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson) took the chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

WAR SERVICE HOMES.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRANCH.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—The Government is calling for applications from persons willing to fill positions in the South Australian branch of the War Service Homes Department, and an expenditure of between £5,000 and £6,000 is contemplated. As in that State there is already efficient and cheap provision for the building of soldiers' homes, I ask the Prime Minister to look into the matter with a view of preventing the waste of public money by the creation of a new and unnecessary Department?

Mr. HUGHES.—The facts of the case are not known to me, but I shall look into the matter.

INCREASE OF RENTS.

Dr. MALONEY.—One of the oldest and longest established ironmongery firms in Melbourne has decided to close, because the rental of its premises has been increased 60 per cent. In view of the continual raising of rents, I ask the Prime Minister if he will take action to prevent unjust increases?

Mr. HUGHES.—I do not know of any action that is within the ambit of the Commonwealth authority. Increases of rent *per se* are beyond the power of any Legislature to prevent, they being due to the depreciation of money, the appreciation of goods, the increase of costs of production, and other economic causes with which the honorable gentleman, in common with every other citizen, must be familiar. The increasing of rents is a phase of the phenomenon of high prices which confronts the whole world. There are, however, increases which do not come within that category, and are unjust; and I regret that I know of nothing that the Commonwealth *qua* Commonwealth can do to prevent them.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. TUDOR.—Will the Prime Minister introduce a Bill to amend the Public Accounts Act so that the Labour party may be given the same representation on the Committee as it has had during previous Parliaments?

Mr. HUGHES.—I assume that the honorable member's question arises out of the remarks made by the honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page), when I moved last week for the appointment of certain members to the Committee. The matter is a difficult one to deal with, because regard must be had to the representation from the Senate. I understand that in previous Parliaments the Ministerial and the Labour party have each had three representatives from this House, and that the Ministerial party has had two representatives from the Senate, while the Labour party has been represented by one senator. Last week, it was stated on behalf of the Labour party that, as its strength in this House was increased at the elections by two, its representation on the Accounts Committee should not be decreased, a contention that I quite appreciate. I would remind the honorable member, however, that if the parties in Parliament are to be represented on the Committee in proportion to their numerical strength, there must be a representative to every eleven or twelve members. The Country party would thus be entitled to one representative on the Committee, the Ministerial party to three representatives, because its membership numbers thirty-eight, and the Labour party to two representatives. If the membership of the Committee were increased to ten, seven members being drawn from this House and three from the Senate, there would be the possibility of a deadlock.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—And the balance between the two Houses would be disturbed.

Mr. HUGHES.—To meet the honorable gentleman, I am willing to do this: If the motion that I have moved is passed, I shall, before the House adjourns for the visit of the Prince of Wales, bring in a Bill increasing the membership of the Committee by one, and giving the additional representative to the Labour party, and, personally, I shall support it. I cannot guarantee to do more than that.

INDUSTRIAL CONVENTION.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—On what basis will the trade unions of the Commonwealth be represented at the proposed industrial convention to be called together by the Prime Minister?

Mr. HUGHES.—There will be an equal number of representatives of organized labour and of organized employers respectively. The Trades Halls throughout Australia have been asked to nominate five representatives in each State, leaving the unattached unions, such as the Australian Workers Union, to nominate another representative. That will mean that each State will nominate six representatives of the employers and six representatives of organized labour.

Mr. TUDOR.—On what date is the conference expected to meet?

Mr. HUGHES.—That will depend, to a large extent, upon the expedition with which the parties nominate their representatives. The Government are ready to make a start at any time, but we cannot do anything until the parties have submitted their nominations.

NORTHERN TERRITORY.

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—When will the report of the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the administration of the Northern Territory be available? Will members be supplied with copies of the evidence at as early a date as possible?

Mr. HUGHES.—I have not yet seen the report.

PARLIAMENTARY OFFICERS.

PAYMENT OF NON-CLERICAL STAFF.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Will you, Mr. Speaker, apply to the non-clerical staff employed in and about this House the provisions of the award recently made in the Arbitration Court by Mr. Justice Powers, and which is applicable to the non-clerical staff in the Postmaster-General's Department?

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—It has already been decided to readjust the rates of pay of the non-clerical employees of the House on the lines of the recent award referred to. The matter is under the consideration of the President and myself at the present moment, with a view to ascertaining the terms and scope of the award and its

bearing upon the character of the work done by the officers employed in connexion with this House.

WHEAT POOL.

Mr. RODGERS.—Has the Prime Minister made arrangements yet with the wheat-growing States for the continuance of the present Wheat Pool in order to deal with the next guaranteed harvest?

Mr. HUGHES.—No arrangement has been made.

NOTE ISSUE.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I ask the Acting Treasurer if it is the intention of the Government to issue 5s. notes, and, if so, will such issue be in addition to the present issue, or will notes of a value corresponding to the new issue be retired?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No definite decision has yet been arrived at, but I—and I am sure the whole of the Government—will be very averse from increasing the note issue.

TWEED FOR SOLDIERS.

Mr. FENTON.—As there is still considerable misapprehension as to who are eligible to obtain tweed from the Geelong Woollen Mills and the Anzac Tweed Trust, will the Assistant Minister for Defence cause information to be circulated so that the persons entitled to the concession will be able to take advantage of it?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Yes.

ADJOURNMENT (*Formal*).

DISMISSAL OF RETURNED SOLDIERS AT VICTORIA BARRACKS, SYDNEY.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received from the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) an intimation that it is his intention to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "the dismissal of returned soldiers at Victoria Barracks, Sydney, while civilians and girls are still employed."

Five honorable members having risen in their places,

Question proposed.

Mr. MARR (Parkes) [2.45].—Honorable members will agree that the retention of returned soldiers in employment,

particularly in Government institutions, is preferable to the retention of civilians who were only temporarily employed during the war, and some of whose appointments are of quite recent date. A number of returned soldiers at Victoria Barracks, Sydney, have been dismissed, but within the last couple of weeks at least fifty others have been notified that their services will be dispensed with from the end of the present month. The permanent area sergeant-majors have been brought in to take the places of the dismissed men. That is quite in accordance with the instructions issued by the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce); but girls are still employed to keep the ledgers up to date; and, if it is the desire of the Department to close up the branch in which these men have been engaged, their services could be transferred to the Pay Branch, which is an outstanding instance of the injustice being done to the returned soldiers. The officer in charge has not seen active service, and of all the officers employed only one has been to the Front. These officers have endeavoured to weed out returned soldiers from time to time, until to-day very few are employed in the Pay Branch, which is staffed by civilians and girls. I think about 400 persons are employed, of whom very few are returned soldiers. Recently the case of a man named Woodrow was brought under my notice. He is a married man with three children, and was employed as a clerk at £3 4s. per week. When he asked to be paid a living wage, the officer in charge insulted him by saying that he was better dressed than was the officer controlling his section. No officer has a right to speak to any man in that way. Woodrow's life was made unbearable in that section, and he was transferred to another branch, but there the persecution continued, until he was compelled to sever his connexion with the Department. Returned soldiers have been dealt with in a most unjust manner, and it is time that effect was given to the instructions issued by the Minister for Defence. Only last Friday the Minister repeated the instruction, over his own signature, that, all other things being equal, returned soldiers should receive preference in employment. The Department is flouting that instruction.

Mr. MAHONY.—Are not a number of the women employed in the Department sisters of returned soldiers or widows of deceased soldiers?

Mr. MARR.—That question was gone into yesterday, and it was estimated that of the girls employed not more than 10 per cent. are dependants or relations of soldiers.

Mr. MAHONY.—I know quite a number.

Mr. MARR.—A number of the girls employed are relations of the officers employing them. As a matter of fact, those who have the administration are shutting their eyes to the instructions issued by the Minister. I had an interview with two returned men yesterday, one of them with one leg, and in receipt of the magnificent pension of 22s. 6d. per week. On that pension he cannot live, and he has been employed as a clerk, but his services cease to-morrow.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—They do not get the same pay as the girls?

Mr. MARR.—Some of the girls get almost as much as the soldiers do. No one better than soldiers themselves know how to deal with these departmental matters, and I protest that they have a prior claim to employment.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [2.51].—I take it that the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr), as a new member, is not aware that, as a matter of courtesy, the Minister concerned is always informed when there is an intention to move the adjournment of the House on any question. On the present occasion it was not until the House was actually meeting that I was made aware of what he intended to do, and naturally I cannot be supposed to have all the material here on which to answer the charges he has made. The honorable member admits that the instructions given by the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) are in keeping with the accepted policy in regard to returned soldiers, namely, that where there is temporary employment which they can satisfactorily carry out, they shall be employed in preference to temporary employees who have not been soldiers. I know, however, that the work of the pay office in Sydney, far from being so unsatisfactory as the honorable member endeavours to make out—

Mr. MARR.—I did not refer to the pay office.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I understood the honorable member to say that even a wharf labourer could do the work of that office satisfactorily.

Mr. MARR.—I did not say that.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In my opinion, the work of the staff in the pay office in Sydney will compare favorably with the work of any pay staff in the Commonwealth Service. However, I shall make it my business to see that inquiry is made as to why the instructions of the Minister have not been carried out, if it is fact that they have been ignored. It must be understood that all returned soldiers are not fit to go into a pay office and take up the duties of temporary clerks who have been years at the work. The pay office is a very important branch of the Service, and experts are necessary in dealing with the pay-sheets and so forth. It would be ridiculous to employ men in such positions simply because they are returned soldiers.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is what caused the chaos before.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Quite so.

Mr. FLEMING.—Are there not a number of men who could take on the job if they were given the chance?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—As I had no notice that this motion was to be submitted I am not prepared with full information, and can say no more just now in reply to the charges.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [2.54].—I hope that returned soldiers will not continue to be employed whether there is work for them to do or not. In my opinion, it is time the staff at the Victoria Barracks was greatly reduced. No doubt, it is a hardship to men to be discharged, but this class of work must gradually diminish as time goes on. I quite agree that where there is work to be done returned men should have preference, but it would be going too far to take away employment from widows and other dependants of soldiers.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—That is not alleged.

Mr. RILEY.—Then there is no complaint on that score. I have visited the Repatriation and other branches of the Defence Department, and am quite con-

vinced that the number of employees should be reduced. We are spending a vast amount of money on our military business, and the country cannot stand the expenditure. I hope that the Minister, while doing justice to the men, will see that the public, who have to pay, are given a fair deal.

Mr. FLEMING (Robertson) [2.56].—It has never been claimed by the returned men that they should be retained in employment when there is not plenty of work for them to do. They desire positions in which they can do useful work for the public and make a living for themselves. I must say, however, that some of the returned soldiers are finding positions, which they are quite capable of filling, occupied by men who did not go to the Front; this applies, not only to the Pay Office in Sydney, but very widely throughout the Department. Good men have been pushed out into inferior outlying billets that they do not desire, while other men, who returned early or stayed at home altogether, enjoy the plums of the Service. This is what is hurting the feelings of the soldiers. I do not say that all men in the best military positions, or all the men who stayed at home, are not worthy to fill them; but we do know of good men being pushed out to make room for others with less forcible claims. No doubt, much the same thing is occurring in other Departments in New South Wales. No one doubts the good intentions of the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce), but we know that the administration of the Department is not so thorough as we would like it. I am glad to hear from the Assistant Minister for Defence (Sir Granville Ryrie) that inquiry will be made. As a returned man himself, he knows what the soldiers are, and he will not see them injured in favour of others who stayed at home, in some cases, simply to obtain the billets left open. There is no desire that good men who stayed at home for special reasons should be turned out of their places, but returned men who are thoroughly qualified should not be made to stand down for others who did not "take the job on" at the Front.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [2.58].—I am glad that this question has been raised, because it is time the public knew how our returned soldiers are being

treated. My experience in Melbourne is that, not only returned soldiers, but their dependants, and the dependants of fallen men, are not getting a square deal. I do not say that this treatment is wilful, but it must have come under the notice of other honorable members that, for example, pensions are snipped down and living allowances taken away. I am confident that this is not what the public desire, nor that women who lost their breadwinners at the Front should be deprived of their chances for work. The Government and the people of Australia are pledged to preference to returned soldiers, but no one can say that the higher-paid posts are offered to them. The arrangements for filling these posts are, most of them, "cut and dried." Even in the profession which I have left for seven years some returned men are not given the fair show that they should have. Brief as have been the days in this Chamber of the Assistant Minister as such, he has already impressed honorable members as a man of honest convictions, who will give the soldier a square deal. I think the honorable member responsible for this motion may feel assured that his desires will be given effect to.

Mr. PROWSE (Swan) [3.1].—The case referred to by the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) is not the only matter of the kind requiring urgent attention. I fear that the promises made to our men when they enlisted have not been fulfilled in many directions. Some of those who gave their word are faithfully abiding thereby, and that applies more generally to the commercial community, I think, than to the various Government Departments. I propose to read a letter, which describes a grievous injustice to a returned soldier who, before his enlistment, served in the Railway Department of Western Australia. He has written on several occasions to the authorities; and the letter before me is a copy of a communication to the Prime Minister—

Believing you have the welfare of the ex-soldiers at heart, and acting on the report of a statement by you, to the effect that if any returned man had a grievance against the Commonwealth Government you would personally try and adjust it, I respectfully wish to place my case before you.

I joined the staff of the Accounts Branch, Department of Home Affairs, Kalgoorlie, on the 7th April, 1915, as a temporary clerk at

14s. per day, which was subsequently increased to £270 per annum, under "G3" regulations of the Kalgoorlie-Port Augusta Railway Act, as from 1st July, 1916. Having enlisted for service in the A.I.F., I applied for, and was granted, leave of absence for this purpose as from 17th November, 1916. I returned to Australia in November, 1918, after having served in France with the 16th Battalion, and being twice wounded; and during April, 1919, I reported to the Clerk in Charge, Accounts Branch, Department of Works and Railways, Perth, submitting an application for reinstatement in the service. The intervening period between November, 1918, and April, 1919, was spent in No. 8 A.G. Hospital, Fremantle.

In June, 1919, I was asked if I were willing to accept the ruling rate for temporary clerks, viz., 12s. 6d. per day. This I agreed to accept, at the same time pointing out my position as compared with that of two other clerks who, with myself, were engaged with the Accounts Branch, Kalgoorlie, at similar rates of pay. These two officers (owing to some physical disability they were unable to enlist in the A.I.F.) were, on the completion of the Kalgoorlie-Port Augusta Railway, taken over by the Commonwealth Railways at their existing rates of pay, and, to all intents and purposes, are now permanent officers of the Railway Department, whilst I, on return from active service, am engaged as a temporary clerk at 12s. 6d. per day, which was reduced to 12s. per day as from 1st January, 1920.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order! So far as I have been able to follow the contents of the document, it does not appear to me that its contents come within the scope of the motion, which specifically refers to the cases of returned soldiers at Victoria Barracks, Sydney. Unless the particulars being quoted by the honorable member refer to the same subject, he will not be in order in proceeding.

Mr. PROWSE.—I thought it possible that this man, whose case I am bringing forward, might conceivably be given an adequate position in the Sydney barracks rather than that he should continue to suffer an injustice in Western Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the honorable member can connect his subject in the manner which he now indicates he may proceed.

Mr. PROWSE.—It is manifest that this man, who had done no wrong, and who, in the service of his country, had twice sustained wounds, has been denied a position which he held before his enlistment, and has been offered another at a considerably lower salary. I was thinking that possibly there might be positions held by those who should not

be holding them to-day, but which should be occupied by returned men such as the individual whose case I have brought forward.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! Upon looking more closely into the motion, I am satisfied that the honorable member is not in order in reading his letter. The motion refers to the dismissal of returned soldiers at Victoria Barracks, Sydney. I understand that the case of the person in Western Australia is not in any way linked therewith.

Mr. GROOM.—And I think, too, that the honorable member for Swan will find that the case in question has been already dealt with.

Mr. PROWSE.—I am very glad to hear that, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision.

Mr. BRENNAN (Batman) [3.5].—I do not propose to give unqualified support to the object which the mover of this motion has in view. I support the general principle that full consideration should be given to the just claims of returned soldiers; but, from two points of view, this motion is open to criticism. In the first place, I sincerely hope there will be a gradual—and not too gradual—reduction in the staffs of the various barracks connected with our military services. I trust there will be such substantial reductions in expenditure upon military affairs, and at a very early date, as will indicate a real intention on the part of the Government to give effect to the stated ideals of those distinguished gentlemen who sat around the table at the Peace Conference. But in any case there are some words employed in the motion which make me wonder, rather, whether the age of chivalry has not passed away. The honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) is complaining, apparently, that girls are occupying positions in Victoria Barracks which, in his view, should be held by returned soldiers. I cannot support a proposal to have young women turned out of employment for returned soldiers or any other persons.

Mr. MARR.—Not even if those returned soldiers are married men?

Mr. BRENNAN.—No. Many of these women are themselves the dependants of returned soldiers. They were invited, and, indeed, in many cases pressed, to take

on this work during the currency of the war, and they, no doubt, have their own serious responsibilities and duties to perform in regard to the maintenance of the families of which they are units. Already there is a disposition to regard as intruders women who have qualified for positions and have been doing their work well, when some mere man wants the position which they are filling.

Mr. KERBY.—He is a bit beyond a mere man this time.

Mr. BRENNAN.—That is something which I do not admit.

Mr. KERBY.—Of course, you would not.

Mr. BRENNAN.—So far as I understand it, I do not admit it, at all events. I cannot join in any request for preference to returned soldiers, or to any one else, as against women who are doing their work well. They should get, at least, equal consideration with any other section of the community. Short of that, of course, I would be very sorry to think that any person should be discharged from his or her position, and that any returned soldier, in particular, should be unjustly treated. I merely rise for the purpose of uttering a general protest against putting into practice the simple scheme which some people appear to have in their minds, namely, of repatriating returned men by thrusting somebody else out of a situation. Our responsibilities in regard to repatriation should be quite different. There are any number of avenues of employment. Some of our patriotic employers might very easily open up some of those avenues which they closed when their employees went to the war. There might be an examination of conscience as to whether they have kept faith with the promises they made with such unction and eloquence that their employees would find their positions open for them on their return; and when we are busy holding public inquiries and commissions we might also institute an inquiry as to how many of these employers have and have not kept faith with the men who went away from their establishments. Many instances have come under my notice in which the promise has not been kept. Moreover, generally, on the declaration that we ought to dismiss girls in order to

make room for returned soldiers, I do not think that the latter, as a rule, would welcome employment on such ignoble terms.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [3.12].—If this is the only way in which honorable members can discover a means of repatriating our soldiers, it shows that there is a great poverty of ideas among them. I have heard very little from honorable members opposite, especially the returned men among them, in the shape of an attack upon the Government for not proceeding with a proper scheme of repatriation. I am not permitted to discuss that phase of the question upon this motion, but there are avenues of employment which they should insist upon having opened up.

In the earlier portion of the war applications were received from thirty or forty clerks in the Victoria Barracks, who were anxious to go to the Front, but were not allowed to do so. One of those men worried me for two years and three months to get him permission to go. I appealed to Senator Gardiner when he was Assistant Minister for Defence, and when the facts were put before him, he said, "I think we ought to let him go." However, the Department declared that they could not spare him. He was in some special line, although he told me that any clerk could do the work he was performing. Eventually he got away, and was unfortunate enough to be killed after having been in the trenches for eleven days. Dozens of the clerks left the Service and got away to the Front; others were not allowed to go because they were permanent men. Later on, in 1918, when there was an outcry against men holding positions at the Victoria Barracks who were not returned soldiers, these men had to defend themselves by pointing out that they were not allowed to go when they wished to do so, and that if they had been allowed to go, they could have secured commissions, whereas at this time they would be required to enlist as privates. They said, "We were kept back for our country's good, now we shall stay here for our country's good." These men were harassed. One man was so worried that he left the Barracks, and it was fortunate for him that he did, because he is now earning a salary of £500 a year.

I deny the correctness of the statement made by the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) that the returned soldier is more likely to understand the requirements and difficulties of his comrades and deal with them. As a matter of fact, the returned soldiers employed in the various Government Departments do not treat their comrades and the dependants of soldiers as well as do those who did not go to the Front. I have heard that complaint voiced by hundreds of returned soldiers. I have been at the Defence Department, and seen mothers and returned men waiting to be attended to, but the returned men behind the counters have not taken the slightest notice of them. On one occasion I had to wait for three-quarters of an hour until I secured the attention of the man who was behind the counter. When he asked me to tell him what my business was, I said, "Will you please tell Mr. So-and-So that Mr. Mathews wishes to see him?" He said at once, "I am sorry to have kept you waiting. I did not know it was you." The point is that this man had no right to keep any one waiting. But the men in these positions know that they cannot be removed from them, and they do not care how they treat their comrades or the dependants of their fellow soldiers.

Mr. MARR.—No one said that they would give better treatment to returned soldiers. My claim was that no one understands the soldier better than he does himself.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I took the honorable member's remarks to mean that the returned soldier understood how to deal with his fellows better than others did, and if that is the case, judging by the way in which the average returned soldier in a Government Department treats his fellows, it is anything but fair treatment that he metes out to them. The men employed in the various barracks at the outbreak of war, especially those in Sydney, endeavoured to get away, and I will not be one to say now that they ought to be discharged to find places for returned soldiers. It is the duty of the Government to see that soldiers are placed in positions where they can earn a decent living, and instead of coming forward with a petty case, involving the dismissal of girls in order to provide such employment, honorable members opposite who are returned

men should insist on the Government discharging their duty.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [3.16].—There is considerable disorganization throughout the community in the matter of dealing with returned soldiers and unemployment generally, and unless the Federal and State Governments devise some scheme whereby unemployment will diminish, we shall always have trouble. On all sides there is the lack of organization, and grievances are multiplying without any redress. In spite of the very gallant utterances of the honorable member for Batman (Mr. Brennan), I cannot agree with him. On one occasion, when Sir John O'Shannassy, an old Victorian politician, had made out a very good case of what he was going to do with the young men of the country, and some one had pertinently interjected, "What about the young women?" he said, "I would marry them to the young men." Upon the issue as to whether a man or a woman should get a position, I believe that the man who will be the bread-winner of some future family should be given the opportunity of securing it. The Federal Government, the State Governments, and private employers are employing women to-day because they are cheaper, and returned soldiers and others have to wait for positions.

Dr. MALONEY.—Let them pay the same wage for all, and we shall see the difference.

Mr. FENTON.—The party on this side stands for equal pay for the sexes for equal work. If that rule were enforced in Government Departments and private employment, there would be more male employees than female. I do not wish to be regarded as ungallant, but I have very strong feelings upon this subject. Any morning one can see armies of young women coming into the streets of Melbourne, not only to work in factories, but also to take their places in all the commercial houses. I do not wish to deny them the opportunity of getting a living, but as long as women are employed to such an extent, there will always be a large number of men out of employment.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—A lot of the men are too mean to marry.

Mr. FENTON.—A lot of them find it too expensive to marry. However, I have no desire to enter into a domestic discus-

sion at this stage. I am not here to deprive womenfolk of employment, but if we expect our young men, including many of our returned soldiers, to take upon themselves the responsibility of the head of a home, we must find employment for them. That being so, although it may seem unchivalrous, I shall be prepared, in order to bring about that desirable state of affairs, to vote every time for the man when the question at issue is whether a returned soldier, instead of a young woman, shall be employed.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.21].—I was very glad to hear the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr), and the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming) point out that there is another phase to this question, and that it is not the desire of returned soldiers that men employed in the Defence Department who, being over the age, were unable to enlist, should be displaced. I have in mind a case which occurred here, and which may be similar to cases that have arisen in Sydney. A man who was in business here during the early part of the war was asked by a Defence officer to give up his business in order to take charge of the inspection of coach work and of coaches and the waggons in the Department. He did so, but has been told that his services are to be dispensed with to-morrow. He is over fifty-nine years of age, and was for years in the engineers' corps. He tried twice to enlist, but was rejected because of his age. Two of his sons went to the Front; one has returned crippled, and the other, after going right through the war, has also returned. This man has to stand down.

Mr. FLEMING.—That is not a fair deal.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is not, and I am glad that honorable members opposite support my view. I have written to the Department concerning this matter, because I stand for a fair deal for every man, whether he is a returned soldier or not.

Mr. FLEMING.—But the honorable member does not wish men who did not volunteer to be retained in the Department in place of returned soldiers.

Mr. TUDOR.—No, I have never said that I do. Where the Department refused to permit an employee to enlist on the ground that his services here were

indispensable, the responsibility for his failure to enlist must rest upon the Department itself. I am glad that this question has been raised, so as to let it be known that the returned soldiers are out for a fair thing, and do not ask that employees of the Department who were not eligible because of their age shall be displaced by returned men.

Mr. ROBERT COOK (Indi) [3.24].—I am in hearty accord with the object which the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) has in view in submitting this motion to the House. We cannot do too much for our returned boys. During the election campaign I promised, other things being equal—and I intend to uphold that promise if possible in this House—to support the dismissal of all temporary employees in Commonwealth Departments who were eligible, and did not enlist, where returned men are available to take their places. There are scores of eligibles occupying Government positions—"cold footers," you may term them if you please—who should give way to men who fought and bled for the country. Our boys have done their share in defending the Empire, and it remains now for the Government of the Commonwealth, and also for the State Governments, to do their part. I feel convinced that a searching inquiry throughout the various Commonwealth Departments would lead to employment being found for quite a number of returned soldiers who are justifiably entitled to preference as against those who did not enlist.

As to the question of unemployment to which reference has been made by honorable members of the Labour party, I would point out that there is plenty of employment for the "cold footers" or eligibles if they are prepared to go into the rural districts. It is at present almost impossible to obtain a man to work on a farm. It is not the question of wages so much as the easier conditions, shorter hours, and lighter work of city billets that stands in the way. All things being equal, I hold that preference of employment should be given to the returned boys, and I shall at all times vote in that direction. I hope that the Government will be guided largely by the wisdom of the views that have been expressed during this debate. If they neglect the advice that has been so ably

tendered to them, they must expect further trouble. If we see to it that, other things being equal, our returned boys are given preference of employment in all the Government Departments, we shall only be carrying out the promise that most of us made during the election campaign.

Mr. MARR (Parkes) [3.27].—There are only one or two points raised during the debate to which I desire to refer. I would not for one moment be in favour of clearing out of the Government Departments, irrespective of his qualifications, every man who had not been to the war, in order to find employment for returned soldiers. Every one knows that some of the women employed in Government Departments are largely dependent upon their income for the maintenance of their homes, and we do not want to sweep them out with a rough broom. We do not wish to turn them all out of the service. Whilst it is admitted by honorable members that a reduction in the present staff of the Defence Department is absolutely necessary, I hold that those who have not been to the war should be the first to be dismissed. In the Sydney office, almost without exception, however, it is the returned soldier who is put off, while men who did not volunteer, and girls, are retained. The honorable member for Batman (Mr. Brennan), it would appear from his remarks, is more or less in favour of the employment of women. While I consider that every man and woman has the right to live, and should have an opportunity to earn a livelihood, I hold that a large Department like that of Defence, which has been built up by the war, should, other things being equal, employ soldiers instead of civilians to do its work. I shall not press the matter further, but, seeing these men have been advised that they are to cease duty to-morrow, I would ask the Minister to stay their dismissal pending an inquiry.

Question resolved in the negative.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

SECOND FURLOUGH PERIOD.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. HAY) asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to obtain executive approval for the payments of the second period of furlough for officers retiring from the Department?

2. If so, will the Minister urge approval at the earliest possible date?

Mr. WISE.—It is proposed to introduce a Bill at an early date which will provide for the granting to officers of the Commonwealth Public Service a second period of furlough. Until this legislation is enacted, payment in lieu of such furlough cannot be allowed.

SECRET SERVICE FUND.

Mr. FENTON (for Mr. MAHON) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Have any payments been made during the currency of the late war, or since its termination, to persons in Western Australia from what is known as the Secret Service Fund, or from any fund the detailed disbursements from which are not disclosed to Parliament?

2. If any such payments have been made, does he feel free to inform the House—

(a) the total amount so distributed;

(b) whether the recipients were military officers, members of the police force, or private individuals;

(c) through what channel the disbursements were made, and whether the usual vouchers have been, or will be, submitted to the Auditor-General?

Mr. HUGHES.—It is not proposed to depart from the usual practice, which is not to make available information asked for in the question. All accounts are submitted to the Auditor-General.

GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY BY TIDAL POWER.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. GREGORY) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Whether, with a view to the economic development of the north and north-west of Australia, the Government would favorably consider the advisability of offering a bonus or special grant to any person who could successfully demonstrate that the tide could be economically and efficiently utilized for the purpose of generating electricity for motive power on a large scale?

Mr. HUGHES.—The matter will receive consideration.

DUTY ON MEDICINES.

Mr. WEST (for Mr. RYAN) asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Did he cause to be gazetted a duty of 25 per cent. on British patent and proprietary medicines, as referred to in a circular from Roche, Tompsett and Co. Pty. Ltd., dated the 17th April, 1920?

2. Has he, in practice, reverted for the present to the former duty of 15 per cent., as stated in the said circular?

3. What were the reasons for the said gazetted and reversion?

Mr. LAIRD SMITH (for Mr. GREENE).—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No. Provision has, however, been made in Tariff Item 285 (A) for protection on pharmaceutical preparations and patent and proprietary medicines made in Australia. It is not practicable, however, for the Department to compile a list of imported articles that should be excluded from the operation of the sub-item mentioned. Pending representations by local manufacturers, supported by satisfactory evidence that any of the articles mentioned in the sub-item are being produced in commercial quantities in Australia, they are admitted on importation under the lower rates of sub-item (c) of Item 285.

2 and 3. See reply to No. 1.

MILITARY PAY.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

With reference to the promised increase of military pay, is it a fact that four officers and ten warrant and non-commissioned officers were, on Friday, the 16th April, paid at a rate varying from 5s. to 10s. less than they were paid the previous fortnight's pay at Duntroon?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—No information is at present available, but the matter is being investigated.

Mr. WEST (for Mr. RYAN) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

1. Has the attention of the Minister been drawn to a paragraph which appeared in a Sydney newspaper some time ago, which stated that an ex-R.A.G.A. soldier, with twenty-three years' continuous service to his credit, who is also a married man with six children, and at present employed by the Defence Department, is receiving only £162 per annum, which is a little over £3 a week?

2. If this is so, will the Minister have this man's salary increased to at least what was set down as the minimum living wage in New South Wales?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No.

2. The minimum rate of pay for the lowest rank of the Permanent Military Forces is £156 per annum, and, if married, the member receives also a special bonus of 6s. per week, making a total of £171 12s. per annum. In

addition, certain privileges are enjoyed by all members, such as free medical attendance, including the supply of medicines for themselves, wives, and families; full pay during all public holidays; and annual recreation leave of three weeks; a generous provision for sick leave on full pay. When in occupation of Government quarters, a deduction of 10 per cent. of pay is made. This deduction covers the supply of quarters, fuel and light, and, in the case of a married gunner, amounts to the nominal rate of 6s. per week. Having regard to the continuity of employment, it is considered that the rate of pay, together with the privileges enjoyed, is equal to the minimum living wage.

MILITARY OFFENCES.

Mr. WEST (for Mr. RYAN) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

In view of the fact that many soldiers are debarred from many military concessions owing to their having been convicted of some military offence, some of which were of a very trivial nature, will the Minister grant a general amnesty to those soldiers who were convicted for purely military offences?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows:—

Soldiers returned under sentences awarded before 18th July, 1919, for purely military offences, have the whole of the unexpired portion of their sentences remitted on disembarkation in their Military District in Australia. Cases of sentences awarded after that date are reviewed by a Sentences Revisory Committee, and many remissions have been granted, including a number of remissions of the whole of the unexpired portion. A very large number of sentences are remitted on embarkation in England. It is not proposed to grant further leniency. Every case where the sentence is not wholly remitted receives very careful individual consideration.

EXPORT OF WOOL.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. GREGORY) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. How many bales of wool were shipped from Australia during the quarters ended the 31st December, 1919, and the 31st March, 1920?

2. How many bales is it estimated will be shipped during the quarter ending the 30th June, 1920?

3. What surplus of the British Government purchase is it estimated will be awaiting shipment after the 30th June, 1920?

4. Can the Prime Minister give any reliable estimate as to when this surplus will be shipped from Australia?

Mr. HUGHES.—Inquiry will be made, and information furnished to the honorable member as soon as possible.

TOTALISATOR TAX.

Mr. WEST (for Mr. MAHONY) asked the Attorney-General, *upon notice*—

1. What amount of costs must be paid by the Commonwealth in respect to the case heard in Sydney this week regarding the proposed taxing of totalisator dividends?

2. Was the legal advice of the Commonwealth Law Officers taken before notices were sent out for the enforcement of such a tax?

3. Will those from whom the totalisator tax was collected be given a refund?

Mr. GROOM.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. I do not know.

2. No.

3. This question should be addressed to the Treasurer.

VISIT OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

EXPENDITURE—THEATRICAL ENTERTAINMENTS.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

What amount, if any, do the Government propose to spend in entertaining and preparing for the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows:—

It is not possible, at this stage, to estimate the sum which it will be necessary to appropriate. The officer appointed to organize the tour of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales has been granted funds to meet initial requirements, and to cover the cost of those entertainments approved by the Government. The Government intend that all that is fitting will be done towards the reception and entertainment of His Royal Highness. It is not intended, however, to permit any extravagance. The Government are relying upon the loyalty and enthusiasm of the people to make the reception and welcome to His Royal Highness all that it should be.

Mr. WEST asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Is it a fact that one theatrical firm has practically made a "corner" as far as theatrical entertainments for His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales are concerned?

2. Is it a fact that in Melbourne and in Sydney arrangements have been made for His Royal Highness to attend the entertainments provided by the same management?

3. Because of the inequity of this procedure, would he be good enough to make representations to the proper authorities, so that

theatrical managers, artists, and employees generally will be given the opportunity of appearing before the Prince of Wales?

4. Will he recommend to the proper authorities that existing arrangements be cancelled, and some fresh arrangements be considered, whereby a combined performance can be given in some theatre both in Melbourne and Sydney, to be determined by the whole of the managements by ballot or otherwise?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1 and 2. The Commonwealth Government, in conjunction with the Government of the State of Victoria, has arranged for but one theatrical entertainment. Any other arrangements for such performances have been left in the hands of the State authorities.

3. See answer to Nos. 1 and 2. The arrangements for the theatrical entertainment in New South Wales are in the hands of the State Government Committee.

CONFERRING OF HONOURS.

Mr. WEST asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Will he inform the House what are the necessary proceedings required before any honours are conferred on Australian citizens by His Majesty King George?

2. Is it a fact that recommendations have been made during the term of office of the present Ministry?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Honours are conferred by His Majesty the King on the recommendation of the Governor-General.

2. Yes.

CORRECTION OF MARINE CHART.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Whether the Government has been informed of the confusing nature of marine charts for St. Vincent's Gulf (South Australia), especially in the vicinity of Wardang Island?

2. If so, will an immediate correction of such charts be made?

Mr. LAIRD SMITH (for Mr. GREENE).—The information is being obtained.

REMITTANCES TO GERMANY.

Mr. GABB asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether moneys can now be remitted to Germany?

2. If so, by what means?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Remittances may be made to Germany provided the money remitted is not—

(a) in payment of a pre-war debt due to a German national or one which has arisen during the war, or

(b) in payment of German goods, or

(c) the property of a German, Hungarian, Austrian, Bulgarian or Turkish national, or

(d) remitted in contravention of the Trading with the Enemy Act 1914-1916, or Treaty of Peace Act.

2. By means of bank draft.

QUEENSLAND INCOME TAX.

COMMONWEALTH WAR LOANS.

Mr. MACKAY asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Whether the Commonwealth Law Officers have yet advised the Treasurer with reference to a recent amendment of the Queensland Income Tax Act whereby the interest on the various issues of the Commonwealth War Loans—which were declared as free from taxation—is taken into consideration in assessing the tax due?

2. Is it a fact that assessments have now been made under the Act referred to, and payment of a tax demanded which penalizes Queensland investors in War Loans as compared with those in other States of the Commonwealth?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Yes.

2. The Government is not aware of the position of the actual assessments. I may add that the Commonwealth Government is approaching the Queensland Government in regard to the whole question of assessing income tax on interest from Commonwealth War Loans.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS EXPENDITURE.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

What was the total amount paid in old-age pensions from the 1st January, 1920, to the 31st March, 1920?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Including invalid pensions, the expenditure was £1,374,392.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. STEWART) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Is it the intention of the Government to have the proposed Convention for the amendment of

the Federal Constitution elected on the system of proportional representation?

Mr. HUGHES.—The method of electing representatives to the proposed Convention will be decided by the Parliament when the Bill authorizing the Convention is before it.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. CAMERON asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. In view of the anxiety shown by officers of the Public Service that the promised Bill dealing with superannuation should be introduced as early as possible, does the Government propose to bring in the Bill this session?

2. If it is not proposed to bring in the Bill this session, will the Prime Minister consider the claims of the officers in the service who, after long service, are being asked to retire this year owing to the age limit having been reached?

Mr. HUGHES.—Amending Public Service legislation will be introduced as soon as possible, but I am unable at present to give any definite information as to when such legislation will be brought before the House.

WHEAT SCRIP ADVANCES— ENDING OF WHEAT POOL.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. STEWART) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make further advances on wheat scrip?

2. If so, what advances is it proposed to make for each "pool" in each State?

3. Is there any prospect of the earlier "pools" being wound up at an early date?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Advances are arranged on the request of the States. If a State desires that further advances be made, negotiations will be entered into immediately with the Treasury and the banks with a view to providing the funds.

2. The amount of the advance or advances that will be paid in each State will be governed by the amount for which each State accepts responsibility.

3. It is hoped that the 1915-16 pool can be wound up at an early date. It will be necessary, however, to await the final accounts from London showing profits on diversions under the contract for the sale of 3,000,000 tons. In one State, the whole of the 1915-16 wheat has not yet been disposed of. As regards the 1916-17 pool, it is impossible to say when this will be wound up, as considerable quantities of wheat are still held in two States.

PUBLIC SERVANTS ON ACTIVE SERVICE AND COMMONWEALTH BANK OFFICERS.

Mr. HUGHES.—On the 15th April, the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) asked me a question relating, *inter alia*, to the treatment of officers of the Commonwealth Bank in the matter of payment of part salary in addition to military pay whilst on active service as compared with the treatment of Commonwealth public servants who enlisted for active service. I then promised to have inquiries made in the matter. I have now ascertained that half bank salary, in addition to military pay, was granted to those officers who were in the service of the Commonwealth Bank at the outbreak of war, and who enlisted after August, 1914, and that part bank salary to a lesser degree was paid to those who joined the bank after the outbreak of war and proceeded on active service. At a Conference between the Commonwealth and State Governments in 1914, it was decided that officers of the Public Service who were members of the Australian Imperial Force should be granted military pay only. I would point out that officers of the Commonwealth Bank, not being members of the Public Service, were outside the scope of the decision arrived at by the Conference.

AUSTRALIAN WOOL CLIPS.

IMPERIAL CONTRACT: PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

Mr. HUGHES.—On the 22nd April, the honorable member for Wannon (Mr. Rodgers) asked me a question in regard to the Australian wool clips. I then promised to obtain certain information for the honorable member. I am now in a position to furnish the honorable member with the following particulars:—

(a) Deliveries of wool and tops for consumption in the manufacture of equipment on account of the British Government expressed in terms of raw wool were approximately as follows:—For twelve months ended 31st March, 1918: Australian and New Zealand wool, 800,000 bales. For twelve months ended 31st March, 1919: Australian and New Zealand wool, 900,000 bales. Total, 1,700,000.

(b) The amount allocated directly to traders at the issue prices fixed on 1st April, 1919, was 450,000 bales. The quantity of wool actually sold by the British Government at

auction since auctions were resumed in April, 1919, until 20th December, 1919, is 1,030,099 bales.

(c) I lay on the table of the House a statement showing the estimated number of bales and descriptions of wool remaining in Australia as at 26th April, 1920. No recent information is available showing stocks of wool

unsold in the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Belgium.

(d) The Imperial Government's balance-sheet is prepared as at 31st March, and will probably be completed at the end of April or early in May. The information to 31st March, 1920, should be available in Australia about the end of May or early in June.

STATEMENT SHOWING ESTIMATED NUMBER OF BALES AND DESCRIPTIONS OF WOOL REMAINING IN AUSTRALIA AS AT 26TH APRIL, 1920.

Season.	Merino (Bales).			Crossbred (Bales).			Total Bales.
	Combing.	Clothing.	Carbonising.	Combing.	Clothing.	Carbonising.	
1917-18..	6,830	6,830
1918-19.. ..	3,667	708	8,003	69,022	32,835	76,684	190,919
1919-20.. ..	387,511	91,805	60,353	467,895	42,029	63,556	1,113,149
Totals ..	391,178	92,513	68,356	543,747	74,864	140,240	1,310,898
	Total Merino Bales		552,047	Total Crossbred Bales		758,851	

NOTE.—In addition to above, arrangements have been made for the shipment of 181,635

Grand Total 1,492,533

OVERSEAS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. WISE.—On the 15th April, the honorable member for Wentworth (Mr. Marks) asked—

1. In view of the general unrest which prevails amongst all sections of the business community owing to the uncertain overseas mail service, resulting in many cases in considerable financial loss, whether he will issue a statement as to what is being done to provide an efficient overseas mail service?

2. Whether instructions will be given for—

(a) Earlier publication in the daily press of the pending despatch of mails from Sydney.

(b) Publication in the daily press when English mails have left England, and when they are likely to reach Sydney, also the name of the ship and route by which they are consigned.

(c) Publication in the daily press of dates when mails from Australia arrive in England, and the name of the ship by which they were carried.

(d) Publication in the daily press of the date when English mails en route to Sydney arrive at Fremantle, Albany, or New Zealand, and the probable date of arrival in Sydney?

In reply to inquiries, I have obtained the following information:—

1. The contracts of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company and Orient Line with the British and Commonwealth Governments respectively, for performance of the overseas mail service, were interrupted by the war, and the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company's steamers were withdrawn entirely from the

Australian service. I have no official information when these steamers will again take up the service, but understand that the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company hopes to resume the monthly running to Australia from July, 1920. The Orient contract has less than two years to run, and the question of arranging a fresh contract on its expiration in 1921 is now receiving consideration. A decision in the matter will be expedited as much as possible.

2. Some of the information asked for is already furnished by the Department to the Sydney daily newspapers, and instructions are being issued for the fuller particulars desired to be given to the press. The Deputy Postmaster-General, Sydney, reports that the newspapers only publish as much of the information now given as they think necessary or have space for.

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, BROKEN HILL.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—On 23rd April the honorable member for Adelaide (Mr. Blundell) asked the following questions:—

1. Is it a fact that the Sub-Collector at Broken Hill was classified as a 3rd Class Sub-Collector in the year 1907?

2. Was the minimum salary for a sub-collector fixed by the classification at £380 per annum in the year 1907?

3. If so, was Alexander David Henry appointed or transferred to the office of Sub-Collector at Broken Hill in the year 1907, and paid by the Commonwealth the salary of £335 per annum, which was £45 below the minimum salary fixed for such office?

4. Is it a fact that for a period of six years and ten months Alexander David Henry was not paid by the Commonwealth the minimum salary fixed for the office of a 3rd Class Sub-Collector?

I am now able to furnish the honorable member with the following reply:—

1 to 4. The practice of the Service in 1907 was to require an officer to work through the grades of his class up to the value of his position. The Public Service Commissioner advises that this matter was settled some years ago, and cannot now be re-opened.

TANUNDA CLUB.

Mr. GABB asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Whether he will lay upon the Library table the papers in connexion with the closing of the Tanunda Club?

Mr. HUGHES.—It is not considered desirable to do so.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

ELECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

Debate resumed from 22nd April (*vide* page 1455), on motion by Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN—

1. That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that as early as practicable a Constitutional Convention should be summoned for the purpose of considering the need, substance, and form of any amendment of section 51 of the Constitution, and that such Convention shall—

- (a) consist of ten (10) representatives of each State, elected on the existing Federal franchise, according to the principle of proportional representation;
- (b) hold meetings at such time and places as it may think fit;
- (c) submit within twelve months to the Governor-General the draft of any amendments adopted by such Convention.

2. That any such amendments so adopted shall be a proposed law for the alteration of the Constitution, and shall be dealt with in accordance with section 128 of the Constitution for passage by Parliament and submission to the electors.

3. That an Enabling Bill to give effect to the foregoing should be introduced to Parliament as early as practicable.

Mr. HIGGS (Capricornia) [3.42].—I wish to add a few words to my remarks upon the motion of the honorable member for Eden-Monaro, who asks that a Convention be appointed to consider the need for and the substance and the form of an amendment of section 51 of the Constitu-

tion. I do not know what hope there is of getting that provision amended, but I am prepared to vote for the calling together of a Convention, because, undoubtedly, Australia is too large to be divided into only six States. Its area is greater than that of England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal put together. If all those countries were superimposed upon this continent there would be a considerable area unoccupied. My feeling is that if the Convention would assist me, and those who, like me, favour the making of a new State in the middle of Queensland, we should be glad to have it, though I fear that at the present time our public is so much distracted by industrial troubles, the high price of goods, and the general disturbances consequent upon the war, that it is doubtful that there will be the interest taken in the proposed Convention that it should provoke, and it would be unfortunate there should be a lack of interest in the work the Convention might do, and that must be done at some time, though it may be at a remote period. The honorable member asks for the amendment of section 51, which sets out the powers of the Commonwealth Parliament. We have repeatedly appealed to the electors to agree to an amendment of that section so that this Parliament may have more power to deal with matters affecting trade and commerce, foreign combinations, and conciliation and arbitration. We proposed to increase the industrial power of the Commonwealth by giving it authority to deal with disputes on railways, and also to get power to legislate in regard to Trusts and Combines and the nationalization of monopolies. We appealed to the people in 1911 and in 1913, and the appeal that was to have been made in 1915 was postponed until 1919. On each occasion those proposals were turned down by the people, though in different States and in different numbers, and such is the peculiarity of public opinion that people who are prepared in one year to vote in favour of a certain alteration will in the following year vote against it. Therefore, I see very little hope of a majority of people in the majority of the States voting to give the Commonwealth the additional powers that are being sought.

I ask honorable members who are proposing that a Convention shall invite the people to give the Commonwealth Parliament plenary powers how they expect to get a majority of the people in the majority of the States to give their consent when the people have, on so many occasions, refused to give this Parliament only portion of the powers that are to be asked for.

I shall support the honorable member for Eden-Monaro (Mr. Austin Chapman) in his endeavour to have summoned a Convention composed of ten delegates from each State. I favour the proposal made by the honorable member for Cowper (Mr. Earle Page) to secure representation on the basis of community of interest as far as possible. I am not in favour of the suggestion made by the Acting Premier of Queensland (Mr. Fihelly) that the delegates to the Convention shall be elected on a population basis. If that were done, it would mean that the States of New South Wales and Victoria would have the overwhelming preponderance of power in the Convention, and the result of the deliberations of a body thus composed would be rejected by the people. On the other hand, if we can arrive at some method whereby the integrity of the States can be protected, giving ten representatives to each State, and so dividing the States as to insure that the people in the country will be given their due power and influence in the Convention, there will be more likelihood of the Bill evolved by the Convention being accepted by the people. But I do not propose to wait until the people have adopted such a Bill. I shall join with the honorable member for Cowper in an endeavour to have a new State created in the northern part of New South Wales. This Parliament already has power to take such action with the consent of the State concerned. Chapter VI. of the Constitution deals with new States, and section 121 provides that this Parliament "may admit to the Commonwealth or establish new States." I assume the section to mean that if the residents of the Northern Rivers District of New South Wales, for instance, could induce the State Parliament to give them authority to create a new State, this Parliament could grant them representation. But section 124 says:—

A new State may be formed by separation of territory from a State, but only with the consent of the Parliament thereof, and a new

Mr. Higgs.

State may be formed by the union of two or more States or parts of States, but only with the consent of the Parliaments of the States affected.

Section 123 provides—

The Parliament of the Commonwealth may, with the consent of the Parliament of a State, and the approval of the majority of the electors of the State voting upon the question, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of the State, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed on, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any State affected.

As has been said by the honorable member for Cowper, certain States still have non-elective Houses of Parliament. I am not sure how the Legislative Council in Queensland would vote on the question of the creation of new States in Queensland—one in the north, another in the centre, and the south to remain under the present legislature. Although the Queensland Parliament has power to divide the State into new provinces, and although a number of men in that Parliament are pledged to the creation of new States, yet it is a singular fact that many of them when they get into power, became apathetic in regard to that matter. The late Mr. Kidston was such a one. I have no wish to say anything derogatory of the deceased gentleman, because he was a splendid parliamentarian. Unhappily, we never say that a politician is a statesman until he is dead. But the deceased gentleman was a statesman, and much of the legislation he introduced into Queensland has proved very beneficial. He, when a private member, was in favour of the creation of a separate State in Central Queensland, but when he became Premier, he appeared not to like the prospect of being shorn of some of his importance by the division of the State, and during his term of office nothing was done to further the movement that was started for that purpose. The movement was very active in Queensland in 1892; indeed, a Bill was actually introduced into the Legislative Assembly, by Sir Samuel Griffith "to provide for the division of the Colony of Queensland into provinces, and for the better government of the Colony as so divided." The preamble read—

Whereas it would be for the general benefit of the people of Queensland that the local affairs of the southern, central, and northern divisions thereof should be administered by the people of those divisions respectively, that the general affairs of the

whole colony should continue to be governed and administered by a general Parliament, and a general Government: And whereas for that purpose it is desirable that the colony should be divided into provinces, and that provision should be made for the future constitution of other provinces to form part of the said colony: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

This Bill provided for the creation of a Senate by the cutting up of Queensland into three provinces. The measure was brought forward by Sir Samuel Griffith on the 23rd June, 1892, and it is most interesting to note the striking resemblance between its clauses and the sections of the Federal Constitution. The powers of the proposed General Assembly of Queensland, as set forth in Part V. of the Bill, bear a remarkable resemblance to those contained in section 51 of our Constitution, providing evidence of the very important part played by Sir Samuel Griffith as a member of the Federal Convention. Indeed, paragraphs were apparently taken from the Queensland Bill and embodied whole and without alteration in section 51 of the Constitution. For example, the Bill refers to the "Regulation of Trade and Commerce with other countries, and among the several provinces." Practically the only difference between it and the corresponding paragraph of section 51 is the substitution of "States" for "Provinces." The paragraphs in section 51 relating to quarantine, sea fisheries, census and statistics, currency, coinage and legal tender, banking and the issue of paper money, weights and measures, bills of exchange and promissory notes, insolvency, copyrights and patents of inventions, designs and trade marks, naturalization and aliens, following one another in that order, were apparently taken bodily from the Bill and placed in section 51 of the Constitution.

Some honorable members are anxious to acquire for the Commonwealth the whole of the powers now possessed by the States, with a view to re-issuing some of them to provincial legislatures or councils. One honorable member has suggested, by interjection, that control of education ought to be taken from the States. Honorable members may be interested to know that the powers which Sir Samuel Griffith and his Government proposed in 1892 should

be retained by the provinces of Queensland included: "The management and sale of the public lands within the province, and of all minerals therein; the registration of titles to lands; education; the establishment, maintenance, and management of public and reformatory prisons; the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions; local works and undertakings, including the construction and management of railways; municipal institutions; licences for trading and other purposes in order to raise revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes; the administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure of civil matters in those courts; the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects within the powers of the legislature of the province; and the appropriation of the provincial revenue to any purpose whatsoever." The provincial legislatures were to be allowed to raise money "by any mode or system of taxation except customs or excise."

I shall help the honorable member for Eden-Monaro (Mr. Austin Chapman) and the Government to have a Convention appointed, believing that the discussion of matters which are to some extent influencing the public mind at the present time, and which will, no doubt, influence it to a greater extent later on, when the troubles which have arisen in consequence of the war have been settled, will assist the honorable member for Cowper and myself in our endeavour to get new States created in Queensland, and at least one new State in New South Wales.

Mr. PROWSE.—New States all round.

Mr. HIGGS.—I agree with the honorable member for Swan, that new States all round should be created, but I fear that the Convention may try to do so much that it will fail. It may take us fifty years to reach that stage of public opinion, at which some honorable members aim, when the States will consent to the Federal Parliament taking the map and cutting the Commonwealth into thirty-one or more provinces, as suggested by the honorable member for Cowper.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Would the honorable member be in favour of drawing a line from east to west, constituting a tropical State, with special representation and legislation?

Mr. HIGGS.—I cannot say that I would. If the honorable member has in mind the idea of allowing, or passing, legislation which would promote the introduction of Eastern races—

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I did not say that.

Mr. HIGGS.—Then why a line from east to west, unless the honorable member can see a difference in climate, and wishes legislation to meet the difference?

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I mean peculiar legislation for the treatment of such country.

Mr. HIGGS.—The honorable member might by interjection indicate what he means.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—We require suitable labour straightway. I never advocated anything else.

Mr. HIGGS.—Australia has a great problem to solve, and, to my mind, many years must pass before we are able to settle an area like the Northern Territory. Britishers, and the descendants of Britishers, in trying to settle and develop that enormous area, have undertaken a stupendous task. In Queensland I am frequently amazed when I see men going out into the northern parts, away from all the comforts of civilization that we enjoy in these southern cities.

Mr. GREGORY.—And they take their wives and children with them.

Mr. HIGGS.—That is so; and it is curious that men who were born in the tropical or sub-tropical parts of Australia have no desire to live in a place like Melbourne. In the northern parts they seem to enjoy better health and work better, and they even go so far as to say that they prefer the summer months there to those of the winter. It would, in my opinion, be a dangerous experiment to introduce coloured labour. It would be better for us to continue on our present lines, even if we have to leave the Northern Territory empty.

Mr. BOWDEN.—That is not the only alternative.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—It is, pretty nearly.

Mr. HIGGS.—An alternative may be suggested. It might be shown what could be done by better housing in the

northern parts, by a better knowledge of hygiene and of the proper foods for such a climate. Reforms in these directions might make a great difference to the health and comfort of the people there; but I do not see anything inviting in the idea of cutting Australia by a line from east to west, just below the hotter portions of the continent. I am, however, quite in favour of giving to those people in Australia who consider that they are in a position to govern themselves an opportunity of establishing new States, with their own Parliaments, and the powers that are now possessed under existing Constitutions. When some of my friends insist that the Commonwealth Parliament ought to have what we might term domestic powers, I point out that in Queensland at present there are large majorities in the Legislative Assembly, and also in the nominee Legislative Council, representing the Labour party. That Parliament is now endeavouring to cope with the problem which is causing people in the south so much trouble—the problem of profiteering. The Queensland Parliament has passed an Anti-Profiteering Act, and, as it is now being administered, we shall soon know what success it may have.

May I point out, in support of the contention of the honorable member for Cowper (Dr. Earle Page) and myself in favour of new States, that there is now a continual process of centralization because of the presence of Parliaments in Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane. This may be seen from a glance at the census figures. According to the census of 1901, there were 110,580 people in the northern division of Queensland, and, in 1911, these had increased to only 119,279. In Central Queensland, where I would like to see a new State, there were 64,192 people in 1901, and only 72,543 in 1911. In South Queensland, in 1901, there were 328,120 people, and, in 1911, 412,221. Out of a total increase of 100,000 people in the ten years, no fewer than 85,000 are accounted for by Southern Queensland.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Can you tell what proportion of the 85,000 people is in Brisbane and suburbs?

Mr. HIGGS.—I regret I cannot give the figures, but there would be a greater proportion of increase there than in the country districts. Sydney, for example, has a population of nearly 800,000.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is 1,000,000 now.

Mr. HIGGS.—Some country towns of New South Wales are absolutely being depleted of population. I should like to place on record some comparative figures dealing with areas. The area of Queensland itself is 668,497 square miles, and there are three great divisions that almost shape themselves naturally into different States, geographically, and, perhaps, to some extent, climatically. In Northern Queensland, there are 250,237 square miles; in Central Queensland, 208,980; and in Southern Queensland, 209,275.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What is the area of Victoria?

Mr. HIGGS.—The area of Victoria is 87,884 square miles. My own electorate of Capricornia is about the same area as Victoria, and I believe that the Federal constituency of Maranoa is about twice as large as this State.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—It is nearly as large as New South Wales.

Mr. HIGGS.—Tasmania, with an area of 26,215 square miles, has had a local Parliament for fifty-three years, at the beginning of which period the population was 75,000. Queensland received separation from New South Wales on the 10th December, 1859, when the population of the State was 28,000. These figures ought to weigh with honorable members, who may be afraid that the 72,000 people in Central Queensland may not have the intelligence or experience to govern themselves. But the educational record of Central Queensland—the successes of the Queensland students at the University in Victoria, and other States—show that mentally and physically—

Mr. MAHONY.—Can you say anything of the spiritual side?

Mr. HIGGS.—I think that spiritually Queensland compares very favorably, while politically it is about the most democratic State of the Commonwealth. I have been informed by travellers in Queensland that they consider the people there the most sociable in Australia.

I hope this discussion will assist those who desire the creation of new States. I am not so much concerned about this Parliament receiving many additional domestic powers; indeed, I think that we find ourselves too frequently considering domestic questions of the States to the exclusion of many national matters which ought to receive our attention.

Mr. MAHONY.—Would not the programme as put forward by the Australian Labour movement meet the position?

Mr. HIGGS.—It might not, for the reason that the programme outlined by the honorable member himself the other day is of such a far-reaching character that the people of Australia may not be inclined to include it in any proposed alteration of the Constitution. It might be the means of wasting years of our labour, when we could be doing good work in the creation of new States with the powers we already possess. We are, as I say, occupied in the discussion of State domestic questions when we ought to be considering national questions arising out of the war. What is to be our position in the world? What opinions have we on foreign relations? What is our position with regard to Treaties with other nations? Are we entitled to make our own Treaties? No; London has too much influence. However, I shall not go into these questions, but merely say that we ought not to be so keen about getting domestic powers for this Parliament as about availing ourselves of the power we have, under section 51 of the Constitution, to create new States. We should indicate by a resolution of both Houses of this Parliament that we are prepared, if the States are, to agree to the creation of new States within their territories in order that important areas concerned may be developed and the whole of Australia correspondingly benefited.

Mr. KERBY (Ballarat) [4.16].—I congratulate the honorable member for Eden-Monaro (Mr. Chapman) upon having brought forward this highly-important subject. A paragraph in the Governor-General's speech dealt with the same matter, but the honorable member for Eden-Monaro regarded it as somewhat ambiguous. It was sufficient, at any rate, to show that the Government had in mind the creation of a Convention for such purposes as the honorable member himself desires consideration upon. I am quite in accord with the principle set out by the honorable member; but I move to amend his motion as follows:—

That, in clause 1, the words, "a Constitutional Convention should be summoned" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words, "legislative provision should be made for the summoning of a Convention"; and that the words, "Section 51 of" be left out.

That, in sub-paragraph (a), all the words after the words "consist of" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words, "an equal number of representatives of each State."

That clause 3 be left out.

There is no doubt that the time has arrived when the Constitution should be amended. It was framed twenty years ago by the ablest statesmen then in Australia, and it has performed magnificent service; but it has faults which are too numerous to be referred to in detail, as suggested in the motion. The only way in which we can hope to satisfactorily amend the Constitution is by summoning a Convention and placing the whole of the Constitution before it so that the delegates may report upon any suggested alterations.

Mr. RILEY.—Why should not this Parliament place a Constitution before the country?

Mr. FENTON. — It will be a waste of time and money to call together a Convention.

Mr. KERBY.—Honorable members know full well that if this Parliament were to propose amendments to the Constitution the matter would be made one of party, and would be fought on party lines.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Then a Convention would not be elected on party lines?

Mr. KERBY.—I have not suggested that a Convention should be elected. At present we have six States, all jealous of their own State rights; and they are exercising those rights to the detriment of Australia. The six State Governments are the members of the Federation which adopted the original Constitution. One of the sections of the Constitution sets out, in effect, that all the States are to have equal rights. There were to be no hindrances in the matter of trade across the boundaries; there was to be free trade between the States. We find that that section has been interpreted very much according to the desires of certain States. Within three months of the outbreak of the war New South Wales, which had a surplus supply of wheat, prohibited export to the neighbouring States which were urgently in need. When, about six months later, Queensland was experiencing somewhat of a drought, and owners desired to send their stock into New South Wales for agist-

ment, the Queensland State authorities insisted upon the payment of a tax of 10s. per head, by way of guarantee that those cattle would be returned into Queensland. The inspection duties on fruit sent to Western Australia are equivalent to a very high import duty. Instances such as these show that we have not free trade across the boundaries; and such a state of affairs is not for the good of Australia. By altering the Constitution so as to give the Commonwealth Government supreme power, State boundaries would be virtually done away with. The Australian Government then would speak with one voice, and would legislate on national affairs instead of having to participate, as at present, in domestic arrangements.

I am very much in favour of the scheme suggested by the Australian Labour party. At present, we find in the six States that there is a great tendency to centralization, which is one of the severest curses afflicting this young country. It is only by cutting up the huge States into a number of smaller States, and by giving each section control of its own domestic arrangements, that we can hope to overcome the evils of the present process of centralization. The populations of all the capital cities are rapidly increasing, while rural populations are decreasing. This is simply due to the fact that a majority of the people have congregated in the cities, and have exercised the preponderance of power in the management of States, and, in so doing, have legislated for the benefit of the cities as against the country. The effect of splitting up the States, on the principle proposed by the Australian Labour party, would be to make each unit self-centred. We would then find—using the illustration of the honorable member for Wannon (Mr. Rodgers)—that a port such as Portland would be put to the use for which nature intended it, and that the people of that neighbourhood would no longer be compelled to deal with Port Melbourne in the matter of the export of their produce.

All honorable members must admit the urgent necessity for amending the Constitution, and it is undoubtedly better that that amendment should be made by evolution rather than by revolution. When the honorable member for Parkes (Mr. Marr) employed that phrase, in the course of debate upon this motion last

week, the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) queried the soundness of the expression; and when reference was made to the condition of affairs in Northern Europe, the honorable member was inclined to scoff. If he had had a little recent personal experience such as must have been calculated to bring under his notice the horrors of the war—let alone those of civil warfare—the honorable member for Barrier would now be much more inclined to favour the alteration of our Constitution by evolution rather than by revolution. An honorable member stated last week that the Commonwealth Government should accept the responsibility of passing legislation to adopt various necessary amendments to the Constitution, but this point was evidently overlooked, namely, that, in the first place, the consent of the State Parliaments must be secured. Those Parliaments are already very jealous of their rights.

MR. FENTON.—There is no need to consult them at all. Consult the people.

MR. KERBY.—They have been consulted on several occasions, and they have turned down the propositions put before them. At this stage, I ask leave to continue my remarks upon a future occasion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BROKEN HILL MINING INDUSTRY.

MR. CONSIDINE (Barrier) [4.28].—I move—

1. That a Royal Commission be appointed to investigate and report upon the conditions in connexion with the mining industry at Broken Hill, and more particularly with regard to (a) cost of production of output; (b) wages of employees; (c) hours and other conditions of labour; (d) health of those engaged in the industry, and the causes of the undermining thereof; (e) selling prices and conditions of or in connexion with the sale of metals and other output; (f) profits arising from the industry and its method of distribution.

2. That such Royal Commission shall have power to summon witnesses and examine them on oath, and to order the production of such papers as the Commission may consider necessary for the purposes of the investigation, and shall have all such other powers as the Royal Commission may consider necessary for effectively performing their functions.

My purpose is that the circumstances appertaining to the mining industry, as carried on at Broken Hill, may be thoroughly investigated, not only in the terms of the motion—that is, in respect to wages and conditions of employment—

but more particularly as regards the health of employees, and the causes which are undermining health. This latter factor is directly responsible for the great industrial upheaval which has established a record in the history of Australian industry, and which is now in its twelfth month. Broken Hill miners have been forced into their present position owing to the conditions under which they have had to work, owing to the poisoning of their systems by the lead which they are mining, to the phthisis from which their occupation makes them suffer, and to the terrible death-rate among the infant children of those who are engaged in the industry, as borne out by the statistics I brought under the notice of honorable members on the last occasion on which I referred to this subject. The Commonwealth Statistician has shown that Broken Hill has the largest infantile death-rate in the Commonwealth, and his figures are only in harmony with the findings of such an eminent authority on industrial or occupational diseases as is Sir Thomas Oliver. I have the evidence of at least eight medical gentlemen in Broken Hill, culled from the report of the proceedings of a Royal Commission held in 1914, and also opinions given by them at a later date, proving absolutely that they speak with no uncertain voice in favour of the contention of the men as to the effect of their occupation upon them. The strike is now in its twelfth month, and the men of Broken Hill and their wives and children have put up one of the hardest battles ever fought in industrial warfare in Australia, for the sole object of protecting their lives from the exactions of the mining companies, all of whose actions go to show that their only care is to pile up dividends without any thought of the effects of the industry upon the health of those employed by them. A manifesto issued by the Coal and Shale Miners Federation of Australia, the official organization of the miners, sets out the objects for which the men are fighting, as follows:—

The Broken Hill miners have been fighting for eleven months for the following conditions, in order to protect their healths and lives:—

1. A six-hour shift bank to bank, because the unhealthy nature of the work demands it, it being better to shorten the work-day than shorten their lives.

2. Five days per week, because it is essential for them to have two days in every week on the surface in the fresh air

and sunshine out of these subterranean hells in order to build up the resisting powers of their constitutions for the other five work-days.

3. The abolition of night shift, *i.e.*, between the hours of 12 p.m. midnight and 8 a.m., for the same purpose.

4. The abolition of the contract system, because the continued cutting of the contract price by the setting foreman compels the miner to take risks in order to earn enough to exist upon that he would not take working under the day-wage system; further, the speeding up and overstrain under contract wears out the miner and weakens his resisting power to the diseases incidental to the mining industry in Broken Hill.

5. Compensation on the basis of full pay for time lost as a result of accident or occupational diseases, because any industry should pay adequately for the human wrecks it creates or close down. These mines produce dividends at the rate of £1,500,000 per year, therefore they should pay on the basis requested, and not as at present on the basis of half-pay in the cases of accident or leading, and nothing in the event of the victim having contracted miners' phthisis or any of the other diseases common to the mining industry at Broken Hill. The reduction of the life-standard of the toiler and his family to half-pay when he meets with an accident or his health has broken through no fault of his own is a brutal and inhuman act. These men protest against their families and themselves being made subjects of whole or partial charity when they meet with an accident or their healths are ruined in one of the best paying industries in the Commonwealth.

These claims were placed before the mining companies, and after the strike had proceeded for a few months, the miners' delegates met the representatives of the employers in conference in Melbourne from the 23rd September to the 26th September, 1919. The manifesto of the Coal and Shale Miners Federation shows that the result of the conference was as follows:—

The miners' representatives at the Melbourne Conference told the directors that they believed the industry could well afford to concede the conditions demanded and that they, the directors, had not given the matter of health honest consideration in accordance with their fabulous profits. Further, due to the complications of the industry, the Arbitration Court was not competent enough to deal with the matter; also that it was too limited in its scope to inquire into the profits, rebates, and sales, &c., of the companies' operations to see if their mines could financially stand the burden of the log requested by the miners, and if not the whole log, how much of it, in accordance with their profits.

The miners' representatives then asked the mining directors to co-operate with them in

Mr. Considine.

approaching the Federal Government with a view of getting them to appoint a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Mining Industry at Broken Hill, such inquiry to be representative of the mining companies, Miners Union and the public, and to make a full and comprehensive inquiry into all aspects of the industry, such as the companies' profits, rebates, sales, and allowances, &c., also the health of the miners and the conditions of work in the mines, the inquiry, as a result of its investigation, to have power to fix wages, hours and conditions in accordance with its finding. The Commission to have all such powers as the Supreme Court of New South Wales for conducting the inquiry, and to be open to the general public and the press.

The mining directors' point-blank refused to co-operate as desired. Both Mr. Courtney and Mr. W. L. Baillieu admitted that the Federal Arbitration Court, due to the limitations of its powers and scope, could not inquire into the health of the miners, the conditions of work, or into the companies' profits.

When the conference was discussing the possibility of a tentative agreement, with a view of an immediate resumption of work at Broken Hill, Mr. Willis, general secretary, asked Mr. Baillieu whether, in the event of the miners at Broken Hill resuming work under the existing conditions and agreeing to refer the matter of a tentative agreement to the Federal Arbitration Court, the mining companies would agree to co-operate with the miners' representatives in approaching the Federal Government to appoint a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the companies' operations and profits as suggested. Mr. Baillieu replied, "No," and further said on no account would they agree to an investigation into their profits and affairs on the lines mentioned.

I have put forward the claims submitted by the men to the companies, and shown the attitude of the companies towards the men's request. I shall now proceed to quote the testimony of medical men in Broken Hill with regard to the claims the men put forward. I quote first from the *Barrier Daily Truth*, which reports an interview with Dr. Burnell, acting medical superintendent of the Broken Hill and District Hospital, as follows:—

"My mission, doctor," said *Truth's* representative, "is to secure your views on the important public matter of occupational disease. Firstly, as to the prevalence and dangers of lead poison."

"Well," said Dr. Burnell, "I have had a good deal to do with that question, and must say emphatically that lead poisoning follows mining work in Broken Hill. So far as my knowledge goes, there is a difference in the lead poisoning of recent years compared with such disease in years past. Acute leading was prevalent to a large degree in the early days, but chronic leading was rare. To-day the position is reversed. There are but few cases of acute lead poisoning here now. Practically the whole of the cases now are of a chronic nature; that is to say, they are cases from which there is less hope of recovery."

How is that accounted for, doctor?

"The reason is that in the early days of carbonate-ore mining the disease used to attack men very suddenly, and would cripple them up, thereby compelling them to seek treatment before the disease had time to become chronic, before it would generate diseases of the kidneys, for instance, which are undoubtedly very prevalent in Broken Hill. Then, again, those men in many instances left the mines and were restored to health. At the present time the disease develops more slowly, and the kidneys and heart are already affected so badly that when men become laid up, lead poisoning is not the only malady."

You agree there with Dr. Sir Thomas Oliver, who pointed out in his work on occupational diseases that lead poisoning produces a multiplicity of complications, particularly in the kidneys?

"Yes," replied Dr. Burnell, "and those conclusions arrived at by the authority you quote have been supported by practical demonstration. I have found here that in nearly all cases of lead poisoning that I have come in contact with the kidneys have also been affected. I offer that as a possible explanation of the abnormal prevalence of kidney diseases in Broken Hill. Lead also affects the blood vessels, and through them the heart."

To what extent does the disease exist?

"That I am not in a position to say," Dr. Burnell replied, "as I have only to deal with the cases which actually come before me, and their condition generally leaves no room for doubt. To give an idea of the prevalence of the disease, I would need to examine the thousands of men I have never seen. As I said before, the men I do examine are generally chronically poisoned. To what extent others may be affected I do not know. I am right up to the hilt, though—as a result of the cases I know of—with those whose arguments are on the side of the contention that lead poisoning is prevalent and disastrous."

"But," continued the doctor, "there is the disease of pneumonia that I regard, too, with particular importance in Broken Hill."

You connect that with the mining industry, doctor?

"Certainly I must. Take, for instance, the number of cases we have had of pneumonia in the hospital when the mines were working, and you will find that the miners, proportionately, overwhelmingly outnumbered the others. Then, again, the death-rate of those affected falls heavily upon miners, while amongst the others—I mean those working in the town, or women—it is much lighter. These facts are sufficient in themselves. If a town-worker gets pneumonia, his chance of recovery is good, but it goes hard indeed with a miner, and too often he succumbs because he is not in a fit condition to resist it. That is my reason for being emphatic on the point of pneumonia in Broken Hill being very largely an occupational disease."

That medical gentleman traces diseases of the heart and kidneys and lead poisoning directly to the fact that the men are working in lead mines. Further than

that, he says that pneumonia is an industrial disease in Broken Hill, and that it is more fatal to the men working on the mines, by reason of their occupation, than it is by any other section of the public. The *Barrier Daily Truth* also reports an interview with Dr. Birks, surgeon superintendent of the Broken Hill and District Hospital, as follows:—

In reply to a question by a representative of *Barrier Daily Truth*, Dr. Birks, surgeon superintendent of the hospital, stated: "I could not say how many of the Broken Hill miners are afflicted with lead poisoning, but there is a large proportion. Many of the men who come in through accidents have been found to be suffering from lead."

How long do you think a man could work in Broken Hill with a fair chance of escaping?

Dr. Birks: "I think not more than four years, without a year or so spell away. No man is safe for long in the lead mines—that is, the average work-place in Broken Hill, the sulphide stopes, which are much slower in poisoning men than in the carbonates, which are quick."

If lead poisoning is so "slow" that it will take four years to bring about death, honorable members can appreciate what the condition of the men must have been when carbonates were being freely mined in Broken Hill.

"A great many people," said Dr. Birks, "are more afraid of dust than lead in these mines. But I hold the opinion that lead poisoning is the thing to be feared here. No man who becomes affected with lead is the same again—that is, he will always be more liable to be again poisoned. The best thing that such a man can do, is to leave the mines altogether."

I shall now quote the opinion of Dr. Steven, as set out in the company-owned paper, which interviewed him, asking him his views with regard to a statement made by the chairman of the Broken Hill mining companies' representatives at the September conference where his investigations were "pooh-poohed"—in effect, it was said that they were absolutely foolish and silly. The *Barrier Miner* reports an interview with Dr. Steven, as follows:—

To-day a *Miner* reporter sought an interview with Dr. Steven, who conducted the examinations referred to by Mr. Emery, and asked him whether he considered the men examined by him were typical of the miners of Broken Hill.

Dr. Steven replied, "I cannot say that. How could I say whether they were typical of Broken Hill? I can say, however, that I found the condition of the men examined very bad."

Could you say that the cases of the men examined were typical cases?—"I cannot say that," replied Dr. Steven. "I can say that I

found all the cases very similar, but whether they were typical of Broken Hill is another matter. From my experience here I would say that of the miners who have worked in the Broken Hill mines from 15 to 20 years, a very large percentage of them are suffering from lung deterioration; and a very much larger percentage of them suffer from plumbism than the mining companies are prepared to admit. My examination of the miners at the A.M.A. office some time ago showed that 78 per cent. of those examined were suffering from slight lung consolidation to advanced phthisis. From my experience of other miners I should say that approximately 70 per cent. of the miners who have worked for 15 years underground in Broken Hill will undoubtedly show lung deterioration. I am prepared to state that before any tribunal, and can prove it by taking miners haphazardly. I think from the size of my practice I am in a fair position to judge of the condition of health of the miners. We cannot minimize it, and it is just as well to face it first as last, I could bring men here in dozens, and if any one guessed at their ages they would make them ten years older than they are. My percentages of the miners affected have been borne out by the fact that no man whom I reported as suffering from lead has been rejected by the medical referees appointed under the Workmen's Compensation Act. That is a fair criterion as to the correctness of my diagnoses."

You state that from your experience you would say that of the miners who have worked in the Broken Hill mines from 15 to 20 years, a much larger percentage of them suffer from plumbism than the mining companies are prepared to admit. Can you give (a) the percentage suffering from lung deterioration; (b) the percentage suffering from plumbism?—"I say that 70 per cent. are suffering from lung deterioration and 25 per cent. from plumbism."

I do not propose to read the whole of this interview, since it is a lengthy one, but in answer to a question that some may be inclined to put, as to whether the health of the men had been impaired whilst working elsewhere, I shall read that part of it which covers the point:—

Did you ascertain in the course of your examination whether the men examined had worked elsewhere than at Broken Hill, and, if so, do you know the condition of their lungs when they began to work underground here?—"Very few indeed of the 178 men examined had worked elsewhere than Broken Hill."

When you say that you can bring dozens of men who have prematurely aged ten years, can you give any idea how long they have worked here, and how long elsewhere, and at what occupation?—"I make a practice of asking every man whom I consider to be below par how long he has worked in the mines here, and I invariably take a note of it if I find he has worked elsewhere. The answer to that question is given in my answer to the previous question."

Mr. Considine.

Can you say from your general experience what percentage of the men in Broken Hill have worked here for from 12 to 20 years?—"I could not say."

Can you say what is the average time worked here by the bulk of the miners?—"The average could be worked out by reference to my certificates. At the time I made a note of the time worked in the Broken Hill mines by every man examined."

Do the periods shown in your certificates represent the time worked in Broken Hill, or do they include time worked elsewhere?—"The periods shown in my certificates represent the time each man examined worked in the Broken Hill mines, and do not include time worked by the men elsewhere."

There are cases among the certificates where the period worked is set down as eighteen months, three, four, five, six, and seven years. Do you know whether the condition in which you found such men was due to industrial diseases contracted at work on the mines of Broken Hill?—"I have every reason to believe that the condition of those men was caused directly from working in the mines of Broken Hill."

In conclusion Dr. Steven said:—"I very much regret the necessity of giving this interview. When Mr. Courtney, the chairman of the conference held in Melbourne recently between representatives of the mining companies and the A.M.A., said that my reports were unbelievable, I simply must defend myself. I am prepared to back any statement I have made up to the hilt. I hold no brief for either the miners or the mine-owners, but I certainly think it is quite time that all parties should realize the serious condition of the health of the miners in Broken Hill. The manager of the *Miner*, in a letter to me, says he is only desirous of obtaining this information for the public benefit, and not for the purpose of helping one side or the other. I have willingly given this interview for the same purpose."

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Has not this matter already been exhaustively investigated?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—It has not.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Is there not a Commission already dealing with the matter?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—There is a technical Commission at work. In the *Barrier Daily Truth* of 19th instant, reference is made to the work done by Dr. Southwood, the medical referee appointed under the Workmen's Compensation Act of New South Wales, and to whom allusion was made by Dr. Steven in the interview that I have just quoted. The paragraph is as follows:—

During the brief few months that Dr. Southwood has been the certifying surgeon he has examined 169 men for lead-poisoning, and certificates have been given to fifty men, because they are totally incapacitated from following their occupation. Those suffering from lead-poisoning who can still work at all are refused a certificate, because the law distinctly lays that down.

Dr. Burnell, in referring to these cases, said, some months ago, that he never told a man whom he examined that he was free from lead-poisoning. The point is that no doctor can give a man a certificate till he is no longer able to earn a living—till he is a complete wreck to all intents and purposes. This is the law.

Many men who are unable to work have been examined for lead, believing that this was the cause of their health being wrecked, but on examination the chief cause has been found to be lung affection. These men cannot get certificates.

Now, fifty men have been found in the last few months to have been wrecked by the insidious poison that lurks in every stope in Broken Hill. Dr. Southwood has discovered it by an analysis of their blood.

That is the medical testimony. I now propose to read a list of some of the cases examined by Dr. Steven a few months ago—

Miner for four years: Moist breathing, with pronounced rales on both sides.

C. Burton: Whole of the lobe of the left lung loud crepitaney, sound in left side (since dead).

Age 36: Liver contracted, stomach dilated. Here is a tragedy: Flattening on the right side of the chest and dullness. Breath sounds impure. Heart mitral murmurs. Stomach dilated. Albumen present (advanced stage of lead poisoning).

Again: Blue line on the gums; lungs fairly good; liver tender and slightly contracted; systolic murmur in the heart.

Another: Lungs, flattening in the right apex; slight crepitaney in both sides; heart sounds very indistinct; liver slightly enlarged; dilated stomach.

Age 35: Consolidation over both apexes.

Age 32, miner for five years: Consolidation over the right lung.

Again: Prolonged expiration both sides; suffering from lead poisoning; enlarged liver; unsteady movements, shaky arms, back weak; distinct blue line on the gums.

Age 33: Consolidation over the right apex.

Miner six years, age 31: Left lung, moist rales and consolidated; increased vocal resonance.

J. Canavan, age 32: Cavity over the right apex (since dead).

Age 46: Consolidation over both apexes. Lead poisoning.

Age 24: Right lung, apex consolidated.

Age 25: Crepitant rales in the right apex.

Miner for two years: Flattening of the right apex.

Age 43: Tubular breathing, with crepitant rales on the right side; consolidation; whole right lung contracted.

Miner nine years, age 31: Crepitant rales on the right lung; lead poisoning.

Miner seven years, age 29: Consolidated right apex.

Miner for seven years: Right lung consolidated; lead poisoning.

Age 34: Consolidation of the right lung; lead poisoning.

Age 31: Crepitant rales on both sides.

Miner 13 years: Right lung consolidated.

Age 29: Crepitant rales over both lungs.

Age 32: Consolidation of the left apex.

Miner 5 years, age 29: Apex of the right lung consolidated; moist rales.

Miner 10 years: Loud bronchitic rales all over both lungs.

Age 30: Consolidation of the right apex.

Age 40: Consolidation of the left lung.

Age 35: Consolidation of the right side.

Age 45: Consolidation of both apexes; crepitant rales in the right lung.

J. Jordan: Left apex dull; crepitant rales; tubular breathing at the base; right lung bronchial at the apex; lead poisoning (since dead).

Miner four years: Lead poisoning.

Miner four and a half years, age 28: Consolidation of the right side.

Age 43: Right lung, cavity at the apex, marked consolidation; tubular breathing.

Age 45: Consolidation of both apexes.

Age 38: Right lung consolidated, moist rales.

Age 43: Consolidation of the right side.

Age 41: Consolidation of the right lung; lead poisoning.

Age 33: Consolidation over the right apex; moist rales; lead poisoning.

Miner, seven years, age 30: Consolidation over the right lung.

Miner seven years: Both apexes consolidated.

Miner five years, age 35: Consolidation over the right side.

Age 29: Consolidation over the left apex.

Miner five years, age 24: Consolidations in the right side.

Age 32: Consolidation of both lungs.

Miner five years: Both lungs slightly consolidated.

Age 34: Consolidation of the right side; lead poisoning.

Age 35: Consolidation of both sides; crepitant rales on the left, tubular on the right.

Age 28: Consolidation on the right side.

Age 34: Consolidation over the right apex; lead poisoning.

J. Theodore: Consolidation over the left apex, cavity in the right (since dead).

Miner seven years: Lead poisoning, bad.

Age 33: Consolidation of both apexes.

Miner four years: Consolidation of both sides.

Miner seven years: Cavity in the right apex.

Miner four years: Moist breathing, with rales on both sides.

In the *Barrier Daily Truth* of the 13th instant the following list appeared:—

The following members of the A.M.A. have died during the past fortnight from dread occupational diseases, and another has been sent to a reception home for the insane:—

March 28, 1920—Death.—Mr. A. Soper, died of miners' phthisis (miners' consumption). Certificate of death states that Mr. Soper died of miners' phthisis.

March 28, 1920—Death.—Mr. "Jack" Sampson, died from plumbism (lead poisoning). Certificate of death states that Mr. Sampson died from plumbism.

April 2, 1920—Death.—Mr. David Duggan, died from plumbism (lead poisoning). Mr. Duggan's death certificate showed that he died from plumbism.

April 4, 1920—Death.—Mr. William Staker, died from plumbism (lead poisoning). Mr. Staker's death certificate shows that he died from plumbism.

March 29, 1920—Insane.—Mr. ——— was sent to the Parkside (S.A.) Mental Hospital. This man had been an inmate of the local hospital for three weeks prior to the above date. Medical certificate stated lead poisoning had affected his brain.

The mining companies and Mr. Emery take a lot of convincing on this subject.

All the above members who have died from plumbism have been granted certificates under the Workmen's Compensation Act by Dr. Southwood, the certifying surgeon appointed by the New South Wales Government.

I propose now to show the way in which the Broken Hill mining companies treat the relatives of deceased miners who are without some powerful influence to fight their cause when they are called upon to pay compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act of New South Wales. The following is from the *Barrier Daily Truth* of 17th instant:—

In the District Court yesterday afternoon before Judge Bevan, three cases were mentioned in which claims were made under the Workmen's Compensation Act:—Eustella Myrtle Winkler and children *v.* South Mining Company; Muriel Ann Hawkes and children *v.* North Mining Company; and Eliza Jane Grose and child *v.* North Mining Company.

Mr. J. R. Edwards, who appeared for the mining companies in each case, said that £500 had been paid into Court in each case.

Mr. W. P. Blackmore (representing Mrs. Hawkes and Mrs. Winkler), and Mr. Justin McCarthy (representing Mrs. Grose) applied for costs up to the time of the amounts being paid into Court.

Mr. Edwards only wanted costs allowed up to the time of the notice of withdrawal of objective.

Costs, as asked for by Mr. Blackmore, were granted.

These wealthy corporations having forced the widows and children of the men to obtain legal assistance, having fought them to the very door of the Court before intimating their willingness to give them a penny, have at the last moment tried to get out of paying the costs to which these unfortunate people have been put. They have tried to rob the dead men and their widows and orphans of costs they have been forced to incur in fighting them. Here is yet another case, as reported in the *Age* of 22nd instant:—

Broken Hill.—Judge Bevan presided at the District Court on Wednesday, when Mary Ann Scollard proceeded against the Broken Hill

Mr. Considine.

Proprietary Company, under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act, claiming £500 as compensation in respect of the death of her husband, John Scollard, from lead poisoning. Plaintiff gave evidence that her husband worked practically his whole life in the Proprietary mine, and was in a bad state of health since 1906. He was admitted to hospital in 1907 suffering from lead poisoning, and he was in the habit of missing shifts frequently because of failing health. He died on 11th July, after being treated for pneumonia.

Dr. Steven stated that he had issued a certificate of death stating that Scollard's death was due to lead poisoning, accelerated by pneumonia.

Judge Bevan said:—I am sorry the claim has to fail. When a man has suffered for many years from lead poisoning, his system becomes so deteriorated that, although he may not die from lead poisoning or its sequel, his resistance becomes so much lessened that, as a result, he dies from something which is not a sequel to lead poisoning. That position does not seem to be dealt with in any way by the Act, and I can only follow the Act. I find in favour of respondents, and decline to make an order.

That is the kind of thing that the widows and children of miners whose health has been destroyed have had to face. Is it to be wondered at that there has been a strike at Broken Hill which has lasted for twelve months, and that the wives have stuck nobly to their husbands, notwithstanding the hardships that that has involved? In 1914 a Royal Commission was appointed in New South Wales to investigate the condition of things at Broken Hill, and the following figures, taken from Exhibit 78 attached to its report, show the risks of accident which the miners have to run, apart from the risk of diseases such as phthisis, pneumonia, lead-poisoning, and other occupational diseases:—

—	1911.	1912.	1913.
Average membership of miners' association ..	4,627	5,022	6,996
Number of members injured ..	784	785	959
Percentage ..	16.9	15.6	13.7
Average time on the funds ..	Four weeks, three days	Four weeks, four days	Four weeks, five days
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Amount of accident pay drawn	3,169 18 4	3,272 8 4	4,201 13 4
Number of men employed ..	7,704	8,139	8,763

No man could draw accident pay unless he had been so seriously injured as to be at least three days incapacitated. For the first six months of 1914 the average

membership was 7,402; the number of accidents, 505; and the number of fatal accidents, 7. In the last speech that I made on this subject, I pointed out that since 1893, when the New South Wales Government began to tabulate statistics regarding accidents and fatalities in mines, the Broken Hill companies had killed 400 men straight out, and the figures I have given above show that thousands of accidents have occurred, requiring union-members to pay out of their own pockets many thousands of pounds for the support of the injured. God knows how many have been killed by lead-poisoning, miners' phthisis, and disguised lead-poisoning in the shape of kidney disease and other kindred diseases. The other side of the picture can be seen by a glance at the share-list of Messrs. Joseph Palmer and Sons.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—What has all this to do with the Commonwealth Parliament?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Are we not here to look after the lives and health and interests of the people of Australia?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Only regarding matters within our jurisdiction; this is a State matter.

Mr. CONSIDINE. — It is a Commonwealth matter. According to the share-list to which I have referred the dividends which have been paid by the Broken Hill mining companies are these:—Amalgamated Zinc, £882,500; British Broken Hill, £826,000; Broken Hill Proprietary, £10,945,750; Broken Hill Block 10, £1,585,000; Broken Hill Block 14, £606,500; Broken Hill Junction, £81,750; Junction North Broken Hill, £162,700; Broken Hill South, £2,535,000; North Broken Hill Mining Company, £1,912,940; Sulphide Corporation, £2,937,245; Zinc Corporation, £1,566,650; or a total of £24,042,035. The total value of the properties owned by these companies is, on the present value of their shares, £16,607,000. Besides what has been paid away in dividends, profits have been made and concealed by taking up shares in other companies. The Broken Hill Proprietary had paid in dividends up to the 31st May, 1913, £9,232,000; in bonuses, £1,120,000; and in shares of other companies, £1,744,000; a total of £12,096,000. That was be-

fore that company floated the steel works at Newcastle, which have brought in further profits, and in regard to which there has been a further concealment of profits. The mining companies have shares in the Associated Smelters at Port Pirie. No account is given of the profits from that concern. They have also shares in the Electrolytic Zinc Works, at Risdon, in Tasmania. The directors of these companies are persons, who, while piling up millions in dividends, have treated their employees in the way I have described. Their dividends have been made at the expense of the health of the employees, and they refuse, even in the event of the men returning to work, to consent to any investigation into their profits, or earnings, or the manner of the distribution of those profits. Between 1914 and June, 1918, the North Broken Hill Company paid £750,000 in dividends. It has kept the mine development well ahead, has paid for new plant, and has accumulated surplus liquid assets amounting to £426,982. I get that information from the *Timberman and Ironmaster* of 30th September, 1918. According to the issue of that journal of the 29th October, 1918, the profits of the Broken Hill South Mining Company have been for 1914, £241,838; for 1915, £300,160; for 1916, £466,458; for 1917, £418,877; and for the first six months of 1918, £165,291. The dividends in that period have totalled £860,000; £138,677 has been written off; and the reserves are now £781,470. By no stretch of the imagination can it be claimed for these companies that they are unable to meet the demands of the men for better working conditions. The dividends, I might truthfully say, have been wrung out of the corpses of the miners and of their children. To-day the companies rely for success on a publicity campaign. By the interlocking of directorates, the directors of the mining companies are connected with most of the big interests of Australia, including the press. They are attempting to turn public opinion against the miners of Broken Hill, in order that they may be allowed a free hand to continue the murderous exploitation of those whom they employ. The men have asked for a six-hours day, for a week of five days; and for the abolition of the night shift. The offer made by the companies, at a recent conference, was a week of

forty-six hours for tradesmen employed on the surface, and of forty-four hours for the continuous process workers in the mills and the miners on day shift. That is, the miners on day shift are offered the same hours they are working at present. The company say that very few men work on night shift, and, therefore, the concession to those who are so employed amounts, on their own showing, to very little. They say that those on night shift will be employed only in driving, rising, and winze sinking or development work, while the breaking of ore and stoping will be discontinued on night shift. The contract system is to be retained. The men are still to be at the mercy of the underground foreman, who fixes the price at so much per ton on the ground. If they do not like the foreman's price they can go up the shaft and look for work elsewhere; or, if they are forced to accept that price, in order to earn bread for their wives and children, they have to skimp the protecting devices underground in order to make a living. While the contract system continues, it is impossible for the men to safeguard themselves in regard to the ground overhead, as they have to test it with long bars in order to assure themselves that it is safe before they commence work. Every minute they lose in testing the ground overhead means so much out of their fortnightly pay envelope. The claims of the men have not been met in any way. This motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the conditions at present prevailing at Broken Hill accords with the request of the men from the very commencement of the dispute. They desire appointed a tribunal which will be capable of inquiring into every phase of the employment in the mines, with full power to investigate in open Court and let the public know the conditions actually existing in those mines. We are satisfied that when the people know the exact state of affairs in Broken Hill they will insist upon giving the miners what they are justly entitled to, and will not consent to them and their wives and children being sacrificed any longer on the altar of dividends.

Dr. MALONEY.—I second the motion.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS.—Let us take a vote.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH (Denison—Assistant Minister) [5.17].—This motion raises a most important question, which should

receive the consideration of all honorable members. I should have liked time to peruse the findings and evidence of the Royal Commission appointed by the New South Wales Parliament to investigate this subject. By his quotations from the report of the Commission, the mover of the motion has demonstrated that already a very full inquiry into the conditions of mining at Broken Hill has been made.

Dr. MALONEY.—Hear, hear!

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I am glad to hear the honorable member for Melbourne say "Hear, hear!" Evidently he is acquainted with the work done by the State Royal Commission, and is well satisfied that the inquiry was full, and that all necessary evidence was obtained. His remark and the speech of the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) have demonstrated that the appointment of another Royal Commission is quite unnecessary. What good will be done by holding another inquiry? What fresh evidence would it produce?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Evidently the honorable member was not listening when I was speaking.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I listened most attentively, and I commend the honorable member for the case he made out on behalf of the men at Broken Hill. I am now arguing as to the utility of any further inquiry. I ask honorable members whether a good case has been made out for the appointment of another Commission, involving further expense?

Mr. RILEY.—Yes.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—What further evidence beyond that obtained by the New South Wales Commission could be elicited?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—To mention but one instance, the facts concerning the enormous infantile death rate at Broken Hill, as quoted by the Commonwealth Statistician. That information was not available when the New South Wales Royal Commission reported.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—The honorable member by his interjection shows that that evidence is available now, at any rate, and can be acted upon without recourse to any further inquiry. I do not profess to be an authority on the constitutional aspect of this proposal, and I should like to hear the views of the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan). It is the duty of every honorable

member to give to the House the information he possesses regarding this subject, and I am astounded at honorable members opposite sitting silent when they might, by their speeches, have supported the mover of the motion, and convinced the House that a Commission was necessary. The House desires information, but evidently members of the Opposition do not possess it; at any rate, they were not prepared to give it when the honorable member for Barrier resumed his seat. Were they afraid to support the honorable member? Were they afraid to let what was in their minds go forth to the world? If they were not, why did they remain silent?

Mr. MAHONY.—If the Assistant Minister will sit down, I will tell him.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—Why did not honorable members address themselves to the question before I rose for the purpose of seeking further information on the proposal? I appeal to the honorable member for West Sydney to give us his views on the constitutional aspect.

Mr. RYAN.—I think it is quite within the power of the Commonwealth to act.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I should like to hear the honorable member state the reasons upon which he bases that opinion. His views would be received gratefully by honorable members on this side of the House. Has this House power to order such an inquiry as has been suggested? Much as I value the opinion of the honorable member for West Sydney, I am not prepared to accept it without hearing his reasons. If we have not the power to do what is proposed, would it not be futile to incur the expense of such a Commission?

What was the object of the honorable member for Barrier in making this motion? My opinion is that its purpose is to lift the responsibility off the shoulders of the New South Wales Government. Why should this House be saddled with the responsibility for an inquiry when a Labour Government is in office in New South Wales, and has power to act in this matter? We would be charged with usurping the powers of the New South Wales Parliament, and rightly so. Let the State Government do their duty. As a layman, I contend that it is the duty of the State Government to deal with this matter.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The State Government did appoint a Royal Commission.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—And it is for the State Government to act on the evidence and report of that body. I may be doing the honorable member for Barrier an injustice, but it seems to me remarkable that he should ask this House to do something which the Labour Government in New South Wales have power to do, and should do. Has the honorable member no faith in the present State Government?

Dr. MALONEY.—This notice of motion was placed on the business-paper before the present Government came into power in New South Wales.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—If the honorable member for Barrier had any faith in the New South Wales Government, he would have withdrawn the notice of motion, or he could have postponed it. I think the honorable member would argue that the Government now in power in New South Wales would be more sympathetic towards him than would the Federal Government, and that they would be likely to do more for the miners. If he is of that opinion, why does he not give them the opportunity? We should wait, and watch the attitude of the State Government, who are in office with a majority.

Mr. TUDOR.—Plus Levy.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I do not think the honorable member should be sarcastic regarding that gentleman, who apparently is very accommodating. There is a Government in New South Wales representing the official Labour party.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—And renegades—do not forget them.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I do not like to use such a term. It is said—though I do not say so, because I do not know—that that Parliament is constituted of extremists, men of the same political thought as the honorable member for the Barrier (Mr. Considine). Under the circumstances, it would be cruel and mean to deprive such a Parliament of an opportunity to show their ability in dealing with matters with which they promised to deal immediately, if they were returned to power.

Dr. MALONEY.—Five years ago, the honorable member would have killed himself rather than make a speech of this kind.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—Why should a gentleman so kind and courteous as the honorable member allow himself to get

so vexed because, for the first time since Parliament met, I have risen to speak? Surely I am entitled to voice my opinion, especially in view of the fact that I always listen attentively to the honorable member who interjects. My only object is to obtain information in order to enable me to form an opinion as to whether the Labour Government of New South Wales should be prevented from doing its duty.

Mr. MAHONY.—You are depriving me of an opportunity to speak on the motion.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—If the honorable member assures me that he desires to follow me, I shall sit down. Only the other day, the honorable gentleman told us that he was not a Unificationist, but was desirous—

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order!

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I only desire to say that the other day the honorable member for Dalley (Mr. Mahony) said he did not desire to deprive the States of certain rights, and point out that if this Royal Commission be granted, we shall deprive New South Wales of rights of which the State is most jealous. Why was this most important question not made a leading one at the recent New South Wales election?

Dr. MALONEY.—This is a question of the health of the miners of the Barrier and their wives and children. Has the New South Wales election any bearing on the welfare and health of these men and women?

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—I am not in a position to say whether it has or not, as a matter of fact. I am concerned only with whether the Honorary Minister is in order, and speaking to the question before the Chair. It seems to me that the honorable gentleman is quite in order in arguing that this is not a question for the Federal Parliament to deal with, but for another authority, and he is in order in developing that line of argument.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—I wish to tell the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) that I have as much sympathy as he has with suffering caused in any occupation, and that I have always shown my sympathy; but the honorable member who introduced this motion has asked for a Royal Commission, and it is with that request I have dealt, and not with the number of lives that are lost, and so forth.

Mr. MAHONY (Dalley) [5.36].—I support the motion. The health of the workers, not only of Broken Hill, but throughout Australia, is of paramount importance, especially when it is shown that the infantile mortality at the Barrier is so very great. This latter fact is a serious menace to the future of Australia. If the Government are actuated by a desire to better the conditions of the workers, and give the infants of the Barrier a chance for life, I trust they will do their utmost to meet the circumstances, and not adopt tactics to prevent a vote being taken on the motion.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [5.37].—I intimated that I desired to say a few words on this motion, and I promise not to occupy much time. As one who has necessarily had to give a certain amount of attention, even to matters outside my own State, I cannot help remembering that, during the whole time I have been in this House, and for a considerably longer period, Broken Hill has been a kind of chronic open sore in many regards. It has been the centre of a great deal of political disturbance and unrest. We have had so many different statements regarding this condition of affairs, that I for one would like to have an inquiry that will get to the bottom of it. We have had, time and again, in this district serious strikes, and industrial troubles of a character even more serious than strikes—troubles which have been hushed up, but which I have reason to believe were of a somewhat grave nature. There is a condition of things in that locality which indicates something abnormal. Whether it is that the capitalist is the cruel ruthless tyrant so often portrayed, or whether there are influences at work that merely make the capitalist the stalking horse of their designs, I know not. But I am anxious, indeed, to have the situation investigated, and I believe that there are many people of the same mind as myself. We desire to know what is the matter with Broken Hill. If it is the case that the men are working there under conditions that are seriously detrimental to life and human happiness, nothing should be left undone to remedy the state of affairs. It has been suggested that the record of infantile mortality is sufficient to condemn Broken Hill in an industrial sense. It occurs to me, that in that arid part of Australia, infantile mortality may be due to conditions that have

nothing to do with the mines—that the food of the children may be unsuitable, on account of the difficulty of obtaining supplies.

Dr. MALONEY.—It is the lead only.

Mr. FOWLER.—There may be other causes, and I am merely suggesting a possibility. I understand that while it is admitted that there is a considerable amount of disease following occupation in those mines, having regard to the fairly high percentage of miners affected, the management has done a great deal—indeed, it is claimed that they have done all in their power—to bring about the healthiest conditions under which the work can be carried on. There have been several inquiries into the question, and several undoubted, earnest attempts made to improve the industrial conditions; but products of the mines are more necessary than ever to the industries of the world, and I do not think we can afford to create conditions that will mean the practical closing down of the work. It will be seen that there are difficulties in dealing with a question of this kind, difficulties that require a certain amount of discretion and common sense. To me, therefore, the question is one which resolves itself into what authority would best carry out an investigation of the kind proposed—would have the widest scope, and the most definite power to deal with the issues raised. The Commonwealth is not in such a position. Commonwealth powers, in regard to an inquiry such as I suggest, is practically limited, whereas the State Government and Parliament have practically unlimited power. The Labour Government in New South Wales, surely, might be expected to do all in its power to present the industrial side of the question.

Mr. GABB.—Is that Government in power, or in a position to do so?

Mr. FOWLER.—Surely the present Government of New South Wales has sufficient power to move in a matter of this kind; if it has not, it has no right to be there. I feel certain that if any kind of a case can be made out, an inquiry will be conceded by the State Parliament; and as such an inquiry would be more effective and more searching than any conducted by this Parliament, I prefer to see the matter left to the State. Accordingly, if the motion goes to a division, I shall vote in the way I have indicated.

Mr. MAXWELL (Fawkner) [5.44].—I regret that the motion has come up for consideration to-day. This is an impor-

tant question, and, personally, I should have liked more notice of its discussion.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—You have had three weeks' notice.

Mr. MAXWELL.—But I did not know the motion was coming up for consideration to-day. I have been taking a little interest in the question lately, and have prepared some material of which I should have liked to make use, but, under the circumstances, it is not available. However, I listened with very great interest to a speech delivered some time ago by the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine), when he dealt principally with the health of the miners of Broken Hill. It seems to me that that is the principal phase we have to consider in discussing this question. All these other matters—hours of work, wages to be paid, and so on—in an industry of this kind very largely depend on the question of health. If the mining industry at Broken Hill is a very unhealthy occupation, then, of course, the miners should work shorter hours, and be paid extra high wages. I made up my mind that I would do everything I could to assist to bring about a better state of affairs, if such were possible. The question which honorable members have to determine to-day is whether or not it is necessary to appoint a Commission to inquire into the various matters indicated by the honorable member for Barrier. I intend to vote against the motion, not because I have not every sympathy with the men engaged in an industry of this kind, but because I think that, at the present time, such an investigation is not necessary. Upon a visit to Broken Hill, at Easter, I became acquainted with a number of interesting things. I inquired very carefully into the subject of the health of the miners, and learned that the New South Wales Government had appointed a special technical Commission—a medical body—to inquire into this very matter.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—That Commission has not the powers which I am asking for in my motion.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I quite agree with that; but all these other points, especially the question of hours and wages, depend on the health of the men engaged; and, therefore, the Commission appointed by the Government of New South Wales goes to the very root of the matter.

Dr. MALONEY.—Has it done anything?

Mr. MAXWELL.—Yes; it has examined to date something like 1,000

miners. Its object is to subject every miner at Broken Hill to the most rigorous and exhaustive examination. Before the Commission began its labours, its members drew up a certain form for their guidance, which covered every possible aspect of investigation into the health of the miners. I would like to have shown honorable members one of those forms, which I brought back with me. It has only to be perused for one to be struck with the exhaustive nature of the inquiry. The Medical Commission is composed of men who are leaders in various branches of scientific research.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—What are the powers of the Commission?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I will try to indicate them presently, but I desire to show just now the nature of the examination made in each instance by the Commission. The family history of the miner is investigated, also his industrial history. Then a close physical examination is undertaken, concluding with an X-ray examination of his body. A most careful account is tabulated of all that is done. The honorable member for Barrier asks what is the object of the Commission, and what are its powers. I understand that its object is to find out not only what the state of the health of the miners is at the present time, but also to ascertain how the industry affects their health. The Commission will make a report to the State Government, I understand, and will proffer certain recommendations regarding the conduct of the mining industry from the point of view of the health of those engaged.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Is the honorable member sure that that comes within their qualifications?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I believe so. That is the object of this Medical Commission. Its members are to make their examinations, tabulate their results, and offer certain recommendations based upon those results.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Is this a Government Commission?

Mr. MAXWELL.—Yes.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Subsidized by the employers.

Mr. MAXWELL.—As for that phase of the subject, it was originally suggested that such a Commission should be appointed. The Premier of New South Wales thereupon instructed a medical man to furnish an estimate of the probable cost of the investigation. He re-

ported that, in his opinion, the cost of the Commission would be something like £15,000. Then, in his wisdom, the State Premier said he thought that was too much; he was not prepared to go to that extent. Next, the mine owners—being desirous that such an investigation should be of the most thorough character possible—intimated that rather than minimize the scope of the Commission they would be prepared to bear half the expense. Their sole purpose was that it should be a thorough investigation.

Dr. MALONEY.—A very good thing, too, and I am glad to hear it.

Mr. MAXWELL.—It spoke volumes for the *bona fides* of the management of the Broken Hill mines.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Especially seeing that the managers opposed it.

Mr. MAXWELL.—They accepted it, and it was because of their attitude, and of their practical proposition, that the Commission was given scope to do its work so thoroughly. Under the guidance of Dr. Edwards, who is one of the experts engaged upon the inquiry, I had an opportunity, while at Broken Hill, to look through the records so far tabulated. I was impressed with the thoroughness with which the work is being done. I do not think the honorable member for Barrier would suggest that these medical experts are not thoroughly in earnest and determined to do the best within their powers.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Of course, I do not suggest that, any more than I suggest that the honorable member is not thoroughly in earnest.

Dr. MALONEY.—Where has this Medical Commission established its headquarters?

Mr. MAXWELL.—It is conducting its inquiries in the old Mechanics' Institute at Broken Hill, where the very latest and best appliances have been installed. Everything necessary for the most thorough investigation has been provided. The paraphernalia includes an X-ray apparatus, which is one of the most up-to-date, if not the most efficient instrument of its kind in the Commonwealth.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Not one man can be examined for lead poisoning until the miners resume work.

Mr. MAXWELL.—That may or may not be the case, but it is for the experts to say. I am quite sure that if it be the case the Commission will continue its work in order to investigate that phase

after the mines have been re-opened. One thing that impressed me was the *bona fides* of the mine managers.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Ah, I thought so.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Well, the honorable member is right. I was impressed not only with what is being done, but with the spirit and temper displayed by the managers.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—This is letting the cat out of the bag.

Mr. RILEY.—How long was the honorable member in Broken Hill?

Mr. MAXWELL.—Only three days, but I did the most I could with the time at my disposal, and I went there with the sincere desire—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—How many miners did the honorable member interview?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I spoke with two or three of the miners themselves. One of these was a personal friend of the honorable member for Barrier, and the expression of opinion which I secured from him was this—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Was he a “blue whisker”?

Mr. MAXWELL.—His view was that the curse of modern unionism is the official unionist, and that if one took any half-dozen men from the rank and file of the miners to-day, and brought them into conference with the representatives of the mine-owners, the trouble would be settled in half-an-hour.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Certainly, it would be. The honorable member was there for only three days, and they settled him.

Mr. MAXWELL.—They did not settle me. I had a very interesting time at the Barrier, and made as many inquiries as possible. I had not the opportunity, since the mines were closed down, of going below; but I was conducted over the surface works of two of the principal mines. And, so far as a layman could see, I am bound to state that everything possible is being done at Broken Hill in the interests and for the welfare of the men engaged in the industry.

Mr. RYAN.—Then what does the honorable member suggest as the reason why the men are still standing out?

Mr. MAXWELL.—With respect to that question, I will furnish the honorable member with an answer supplied to me by an experienced miner, when I put this question, “Can you tell me what is the real grievance of the men who are out on strike to-day?” His reply was,

“They have got no grievance. It is these blasted scoundrels of leaders.”

Mr. RILEY.—I guess he does not belong to the union.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Yes, he does belong to the union.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—To which union?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I will not mention names, but this man did not confine himself to generalities. He mentioned names.

Mr. GABB.—How many leaders are there in Broken Hill?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I do not know. The question has been put by the honorable member for Perth (Mr. Fowler) namely, “What is wrong with Broken Hill?” One conclusion which I arrived at, as the result of my visit, is that one of the things wrong with Broken Hill is vicious leadership.

Mr. TUDOR.—The wonder is that there are any leaders at all. The “bosses” would like to have none. I have been told by “bosses” in Australia that they would get no work here.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I am going to give my reason for saying that one of the things wrong is vicious leadership. My reason for saying that, according to my view-point, some of the leadership in Broken Hill has been of a vicious character emanates from an opportunity of which I availed myself to attend a meeting on the Sunday evening which I spent at Broken Hill. This gathering was addressed by a master of arts from Adelaide, who was at the Barrier as the representative of the Workers Educational Association. He was there to conduct classes for the education of the miners. The burden of his address was this: He set out to prove to his audience—who were to be his pupils in the future, under the scheme which had been drafted by the Workers Educational Association—that they were abject slaves. He stressed that every wage-earner in the community is an abject slave—more a slave, indeed, than were the slaves under the Roman Empire 2,000 years ago.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—And in many respects they were far better off so long ago as that.

Mr. MAXWELL.—The lecturer was laying down that statement as a proposition; he did not attempt to prove it, but was simply asserting it. He said something to this effect: “You mine-

are making certain demands upon your masters. What if you get all your demands conceded to you? What better off are you? You are none the less slaves. Of course, if you secure your demands, good luck to you; and if you do, it will be a better jumping-off ground for the revolution which is nearer than most of us imagine." The one redeeming feature of the meeting was that, throughout the lecture—which extended over, perhaps, three-quarters of an hour—the men did not indulge in the least applause. The significance of their attitude to me was that, as level-headed men, they felt that the lecturer was talking utter and absolute rot.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—Proving that they could not be led by vicious leaders.

Mr. MAXWELL.—No; I am dealing only with the vicious character of the leadership.

Mr. TUDOR.—The lecturer was not even a member of a union at Broken Hill, and could not vote at any ballot connected with the trouble there.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—He was paid by the men.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I should not have referred to the lecturer as a leader of the men; but he is certainly a would-be leader. His lecture is a sample of the kind of stuff that is being fed to the miners at Broken Hill. I yield to no man in my desire to see better conditions of labour. I should like the conditions of labour at Broken Hill to be as good as it is possible to make them; but I come back to the point that the health of the miners is the chief consideration. We should stay our hands until the Medical Commission has completed its labours.

Dr. MALONEY.—Or hurry on the work of that Commission.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I can assure the honorable member that the members of the Commission are eager to do their work at the quickest possible rate. They have not been long engaged in their investigations, yet they have already examined 1,000 men.

Dr. MALONEY.—Quite so; but I am thinking of the question of treatment.

Mr. MAXWELL.—The case must be diagnosed in order that the proper treatment may be applied. That is what the Medical Commission is trying to do.

Mr. FENTON.—The results obtained from 1,000 examinations should give a fair average indication of the health of the whole of the miners.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Not necessarily; because the conditions are so varied.

If, as we are told, this occupation is deadly, one would expect to find the men anxious to escape from it. But what are the facts? We find that men who have left Broken Hill, and have been absorbed elsewhere—who have found work in other cities—return to the Barrier immediately there is any prospect of the strike being settled and work being available. That, to my mind, is some evidence that mining operations at the Barrier are not as deadly as we have been led to understand.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—They cannot get regular work elsewhere.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I am not expressing an opinion as to whether the occupation is healthy or unhealthy.

Mr. WEST.—Then, what is the honorable member trying to prove?

Mr. MAXWELL.—I am urging the House to hold its hand in regard to the appointment of a Royal Commission until we have before us the result of the labours of the Medical Commission that has already been appointed by the Government of New South Wales.

Mr. WEST.—The honorable member is trying to prevent the directors of the Broken Hill mines from dealing with these matters until the medical inquiry is over.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Not at all. If I had the ear of the miners of Broken Hill, I would suggest that they return to work on the terms that have been proposed pending the report of the Medical Commission. My conviction is that if the men were left to determine the question for themselves, they would return to work on these terms, believing that when the results of the Medical Commission had been arrived at whatever was necessary would be done. I deprecate this constant girding at employers at Broken Hill. When I saw what had been done—and I think the honorable member for Barrier (Mr.

Considine) will admit that a very great deal has been done—to try to minimize the evils—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Nothing has been done by the employers except that which has been forced out of them.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Whether they have been forced to do these things or not, the point is that they have been done. Nowadays, there is no greater force than that of public opinion to induce employers to do the right thing. Whenever any body of industrialists come forward with a demand which, on the face of it, is just, public opinion immediately ranges itself behind that demand, and makes it absolutely irresistible.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Public opinion is behind the miners now.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I disagree with the honorable member: I believe that public opinion has not been correctly informed of the facts of the case. If we were to ask any man who takes a reasonably intelligent interest in these questions, what is the real point at issue between the employers and the miners at Broken Hill, we should find that he was unable to tell us. I am convinced that whenever a demand that is just and reasonable is made, public opinion will compel those concerned to concede it. One has only to look at the Mines Act of New South Wales to see that every precaution that experience and consideration for the interests of the miner can suggest has been provided for in it.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—That statement shows how little the honorable member knows of the administration of the Act.

Mr. MAXWELL.—In addition to the inspectors appointed by the Government, there are inspectors appointed by the men to go through the workings, to point out to those in authority where improvements can be effected, and to see that they are carried out. In these circumstances, it is difficult, in the light of our present knowledge, to say what more can be done in the interests of the miners. It has been said during this debate that now that a Labour Government is in power in New South Wales, if it is possible to further protect the interests of the miners at Broken Hill that protection will be forthcoming.

Mr. FENTON.—What is the honorable member's opinion in regard to the hours of labour in such an industry?

Mr. MAXWELL.—That again is a question that hinges upon the character of the work. I should be guided by what the doctors had to say after they had made their examination of the men at the present time, as well as after they have been at work for some time. There is some force in the argument of the honorable member for Barrier that since the men have been out of the mines for nearly twelve months, their health, if there was any tendency to its impairment, might have been re-established. An examination to-day might not give as true a result of the effect of working in the mines upon the health of the men as would an examination after they had actually been at work for some time.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—That is shown by the medical testimony.

Mr. MAXWELL.—On the face of it, that is a common-sense argument. According to the honorable member himself, it is impossible to make a satisfactory examination of the men until they are at work again. I am not sufficiently expert as to the nature of the work or as to its effect upon the men from a medical point of view. In other circumstances, I should have felt very much inclined to support the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission, but since a Medical Commission is now sitting—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—It has not the requisite power.

Mr. MAXWELL.—It has the power to make recommendations, and effect would be given to the recommendations of such a body of experts.

Dr. MALONEY.—The honorable member would support a proposal to give effect to such recommendations?

Mr. MAXWELL.—Yes, I would heartily support any recommendations made by such a Commission, and I am satisfied that we should find public opinion strongly in favour of their adoption.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [6.12].—I congratulate the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) on having brought this question before the House, and placed the facts from the point of view of his constituents clearly and fully before us. The honorable member for Fawkner (Mr. Maxwell), whose views I respect, states that a strike which has the force of public opinion behind it is bound to be successful. I have taken

part in strikes in three continents, and have never known a case in any part of the world where the capitalistic press has declared men on strike to be in the right.

Mr. MAXWELL.—I said nothing about the capitalistic press.

Mr. TUDOR.—I defy honorable members opposite—"the wassers"—the men who were Labour men, as well as the "Never wassers"—the men who have never supported Labour—to point to one case where the capitalistic press has supported a strike. Ninety-five per cent. of the press of Australia is anti-Labour, and has not on any occasion backed up the workers. Any advance made by the workers, either politically or industrially, has been the result of their own efforts, and has been gained in spite of the press.

Mr. MAXWELL.—Has the honorable member never known public opinion to prevail even against the press?

Mr. TUDOR.—I have.

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Public opinion upset the conscription referendum.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is so. Public opinion was right then, and "downed" the press. I hope that the unfortunate dispute which still continues at Broken Hill will be settled, that some way out of the difficult position in which employers and employees are now in will be found. I am not one of those who use the term "master and man."

Mr. GABB.—It is dying out.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes, and I am very glad of it. Mr. Molesworth, to whom reference has been made by the honorable member for Fawkner (Mr. Maxwell), is a British M.A. It is the universities of Australia who are behind the Workers Educational Association. The Trades Hall folk have been denounced for not supporting this movement in the way in which the Oxford Extension Lectures have been supported in the Old Country by trade unionists. Most of the unions have refused to join the association, and I understand that the Broken Hill unions have not joined it.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—They are not connected with it.

Mr. TUDOR.—Mr. Molesworth was not invited by the unionists to lecture at Broken Hill, and went there almost in spite of them. Some honorable members have spoken as though union officials

appointed themselves, instead of being elected, as they are, by the members of the unions. I was a financial member of a trade union at the age of seventeen. The organization was then just coming into existence, and admitted apprentices. I remained a member until the Arbitration Act prevented me from continuing in it, because I was no longer working at my trade. But I have my clearance, and it would be accepted by any branch of the Felt Hatters Union in any part of the world. It is not the officials who are to blame for industrial troubles, but very often the officials of the employers. During the recent seamen's dispute, which affected Australia so much industrially, a ballot of the men was in favour of a strike. So, again, in the case of the marine engineers' strike. In the latter case the executive advised the men to accept the terms offered, but the men refused to do so. The same thing has occurred at Broken Hill, and is occurring at the present time in Victoria.

Members opposite have become the apologists for the capitalists who support them, and, therefore, oppose an inquiry into the conditions at Broken Hill. A Federal Commission is to be preferred to a State Commission, because it would have wider powers. It is only a rich company like the Colonial Sugar Refining Company that can defy the Federal Government. In fairness to the Broken Hill companies, I say that I think they would not hinder the making of a full and complete inquiry into the conditions that prevail. We have a right to such an inquiry. The honorable member for the Barrier (Mr. Considine) told us of the lives that had been lost, and, on the other hand, of the dividends that had been made at Broken Hill. He would have failed in his duty if he had not done so. When honorable members say that the Broken Hill trouble is due to extremists, who, as far as their numbers are concerned, do not count, my reply is that the honorable member would not have been elected to this Chamber if he did not represent the views of the majority. During the last Parliament he was constantly taunted with being the representative of a minority, but in December last, after the strike had been in existence for eight

months, he was elected by a majority of the people of Broken Hill, which shows that he represents the feelings of the majority of those living there. Then, again, only three or four weeks ago, the man who topped the poll was Mr. Brookfield, while a "has-been" was turned down.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—Brookfield denounced the Labour executive.

Mr. TUDOR.—At any rate, he topped the poll.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH. — But who was it tried to prevent him?

Mr. TUDOR.—There was no one like the honorable member for Illawarra (Mr. Lamond) for making trouble when he was on the Labour executive in New South Wales. The honorable member for Denison (Mr. Laird Smith) and others who have been connected with the Labour movement know that he was the stormy petrel of the conferences there. I think that even Mr. Speaker knows a little about him. Whatever may be said about Mr. Brookfield's politics and his disputes with the Labour executive, it must be admitted that he was the most extreme candidate who submitted himself for the representation of the district of Broken Hill in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly, and he topped the poll. That shows the feeling at Broken Hill. I spoke in the town once on a Saturday night, and the next day was present at a demonstration in support of the local hospital, which I visited, and the doctors admitted that the lead was a bad trouble. The Government would like this motion to be talked out, but I cannot allow the aspersions on trade unionism made by the honorable member for Fawknor (Mr. Maxwell) and the honorable member for Denison (Mr. Laird Smith) to pass unanswered. They desire that trade unionism shall cease to exist in Australia.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—We have done as much as the honorable member for trade unionism.

Mr. TUDOR.—No. I have a record in regard to trade unionism which I can place against that of any man in this House. I am not one of those who became a unionist after trade unionism had begun to succeed. I have never used trade unionism. I am glad to have had this oppor-

tunity to state the case of the unionists, so that it may appear in *Hansard* alongside the statements of those who have traduced trade unionism, who would make it appear that it is the officials and not the great body of unionists who decide these matters. Time after time the officials have smoothed over difficulties, as many honorable members opposite know. It is the rank and file who declare by ballot whether there shall be a strike. However, as there is no chance of finishing the debate to-night, I ask leave to continue my remarks on a future occasion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—As in the Queen's Hall during the dinner adjournment Sir Ross Smith is to give an account of his flight from England to Australia, I think that I shall consult the convenience of honorable members, and act in concurrence with the wishes of the Government, if I do not resume the chair until about 8.30.

Sitting suspended from 6.28 to 8.30 p.m.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that the receipt of messages from the Senate intimating that the following senators had been appointed members of Standing Committees:—Public Works Committee—Senators Henderson, Needham, and Newland; Public Accounts Committee—Senators Crawford, Earle, and McDougall.

AUSTRALIAN SOLDIERS' REPATRIATION BILL.

Bill returned from the Senate with the message that it has agreed to all but two of the amendments of the House of Representatives.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE CANTEENS FUNDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 28th April (*vide* page 1575), on motion by Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [8.32].—This Bill appears to be an attempt to deal with two altogether different funds

by one measure and in the same way. In regard to the canteen funds this Parliament can do what it thinks fit, but in regard to the other fund, we should be bound by the trusts of the will which created it. There should have been two Bills to cover these two different matters, and the attempt to drag in the bequest of the late Sir Samuel McCaughey as a sort of afterthought under the wide powers of sub-clause *b* of clause 3 does not seem to be at all desirable. Very little objection can be taken to the provisions regarding the canteen funds except the old one that the Bill is merely a skeleton, and that many vital principles are left to regulations. It also introduces the undesirable system of referring to other Acts, in order to ascertain the meaning of words used in this Bill. For example, in the first clause one is referred to the War Pensions Acts of 1914 and 1915, in order to get the interpretation which might just as well be embodied in the Bill itself, and thus made plain for every one to read. Regulations under measures of this sort should be confined to mere matters of detail, but under this proposal they are to be so wide that the principles of the Act will be laid down, not by the Act itself, but by the regulations made under it. For instance, there is nothing in the Bill as to the manner of appointing State Committees. The honorable and gallant member who introduced the Bill told us that State Committees are to be appointed. But their powers will be very small; they would be only advisory bodies. There is no power in the Bill for the original trustees to appoint any substitutes in other States. That will mean that everything done under the Act will require to be sent to Melbourne to be confirmed by the trustees before any action can be taken. There is no power to delegate authority to the different Committees in the States.

We are told that the canteen balances are to be distributed within about six months. It reflects great credit upon those who managed the canteens that there is such a large sum available for distribution. These canteens are not mere drinking bars. They are general stores. At Liverpool Camp, at any rate, the establishment of canteens did away with the very objection-

Mr. Bowden.

able system previously in vogue under which all classes of traders, some of whom were guilty of very peculiar practices, were allowed into the camps. It is a matter for congratulation that the canteens not only paid their way, but repaid to the Treasury the whole of the moneys paid from time to time in order to set them going. But, judging from what was said by one honorable member, I doubt whether the advances made by some of the officers and men have been repaid. The canteen fund also provided money for the sports and recreations of the soldiers. On top of all that, there is a balance of £500,000 available for distribution. The honorable member for Maranoa (Mr. James Page) suggested that it might be better in the interests of those concerned if that amount were capitalized, but having regard to the fact that there may be from 30,000 to 50,000 claimants, and the average amount available for each may not be more than perhaps £10 to £15, it is better that the fund should be dealt with as a lump sum rather than that the payment should be spread over a number of years. The fact that the children are growing up, and in a few years will be earning their own living, seems to me to be an argument in favour of an immediate distribution of the fund rather than of holding it in hand and distributing only the interest. No provision is made in the Bill itself that the amounts given under it shall not be taken into consideration by the Repatriation Department, or in connexion with pensions. The Minister has assured us that they will not be taken into consideration in that way, but it would have been very much preferable to have it so stated in the Bill than to leave it to the regulations which are afterwards to be framed.

When we come to the second object which the Minister tells us is intended to be covered, I find the Bill most unsatisfactory. There seems to be no reason for dragging to Melbourne the management of the McCaughey fund, and although the Bill gives the trustees sufficient power to deal with the Canteens Fund, the McCaughey trust opens up a far larger field of discussion, and the powers given under the Bill do not seem to be sufficient to cover the ground that needs to be covered under that devise.

It is very easy to criticise men; but, after all, we all take the conditions of the world as we find them, and if we leave the world, or our own small corner of it, a little better than we found it—

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order!

Mr. BOWDEN.—That is what the soldiers have done who created the Canteens Fund. I think we can also say that the man who created the other fund has left Australia better for his residence here, and for the work he did in it. According to his lights he was, I believe, a faithful steward of his wealth in his lifetime, and in his death he left an example which we hope that many Australians will follow. The honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. West) talked about the Bulli Disaster Fund, and about the administration of that fund sealing up the fountains of generosity of the people of Australia; but I know of nothing more likely to seal up the fountains of generosity and benevolence than a speech like that to which we listened from the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) last night. The McCaughey fund consists of about £450,000, which is all to be invested. It is not to be distributed as the Canteens Fund is. The objects of the trust are set out in the will, and I suppose will be adhered to. There is £300,000 for pastoral, agricultural, and technical education of soldiers' children; £50,000 to provide in hospitals beds and cots for wives and children of soldiers; £50,000 for subsidies for building funds of the Australian Imperial Force units; and £50,000 for special purposes to be determined by the executors of the will. These things are on another plane altogether from the canteen money, and the trustees appointed to administer the McCaughey fund will have to decide upon the whole policy required for carrying out the will.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The trouble about the McCaughey bequest is that it is not even mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. BOWDEN.—That is so. It is to be drawn in by a sort of side wind by means of paragraph *b* of clause 3. None of the powers mentioned in the will are given by the Bill. The trustees whom we appoint may have to make arrangements in the States for the education of soldiers' children in agri-

cultural or technical colleges, or on agricultural farms. They may have to originate training colleges of their own. They may have to build a wing of a hospital, instead of endowing other hospitals in different places. All these things need to be provided for. I think the clause dealing with the investment of the trust funds is not nearly wide enough, if the intention is to bring the McCaughey trust money into it. I would give the trustees power, not only to invest the money in Government securities or fixed deposits in banks, but also to invest in approved rent-producing freehold properties. I do not think any honorable member would confine himself, in dealing with a large sum like this, merely to Government securities or banks' fixed deposits. These powers ought certainly to be enlarged in order to give the trustees the right to make such investments, which, with proper supervision, will be just as safe and secure as the securities mentioned in the Bill itself, and which, moreover, will bring to the fund an increased amount of interest, and consequently place an increased annual revenue at the disposal of the trustees. I notice that there is no provision in the Bill to preserve the original trusts. Apparently, the Bill intends that the McCaughey money shall become part of the fund. Clause 3 provides that the fund shall consist of, first, the canteen moneys; and, secondly, any moneys transferred to the trustees which the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, directs shall form part of the fund. If the McCaughey money forms part of this fund, it seems to me that it will be applicable for the purposes for which the fund is created—purposes altogether different from those which the will had in view, and which are set out in the trusts of that document. The Bill as it comes before us does not contemplate so complicated an administration as is rendered necessary by the McCaughey trust. The Government would be well advised to let it go through without paragraph *b* of clause 3, making it refer only to the Canteens Fund, and to bring down a separate Bill to provide for the great benefaction of Sir Samuel McCaughey, in order to insure that the objects for which that money was given are adequately provided for and properly carried out. Only in that way can the bequest by the

late Sir Samuel McCaughey be satisfactorily dealt with.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Clause 5—

(1) The following persons, that is to say—
The President for the time being of the
Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial
League of Australia;

Mrs. Alfred Deakin, of Walsh-street, South
Yarra, Victoria;

Nicholas Colston Lockyer, Esquire, C.B.E.,
I.S.O.;

The Honorable George Swinburne;

Major-General Sir Cyril Brudenell Bingham
White, K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O.;

Percy Whitton, Esquire, I.S.O.; and

Harold Percival Moorehead, Esquire, formerly a member of the Australian Imperial Force,

shall be the trustees of the Fund.

MR. BLAKELEY (Darling) [8.52].—Earlier in the debate upon this Bill I objected to the large number of trustees whom it is proposed to appoint for the purpose of administering the fund. There are no less than seven of them. I fail to see the necessity for such a large body, especially as its duties will not be of the same character as those which will be discharged by the State Advisory Committees. The Trust will not be called upon to do any of the detail work; its functions will be limited to the consideration of the recommendations by the State Committees. Where, then, is the need for a Trust consisting of seven members, especially when its duties can be more efficiently performed by three or four? I am of opinion that the measure was hurriedly drafted by one man, that proper consideration was not given to it, and that it has been submitted to this Chamber in a very immature form. I have no desire to differentiate between any of the persons whose names are set out in this clause, and I shall, therefore, content myself with moving—

That the word "three" be inserted before the word "persons."

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [8.55].—I ask the Committee to allow the *personnel* of the Trust to remain unaltered. We must not forget that these trustees are to act in an honorary capacity. If we seek to eliminate any of them, where shall we start? Anybody with experience of honorary committees knows

that three members will often attend one meeting and three different members another meeting. It frequently happens that a quorum is obtained from certain members upon one day and a quorum from different members upon another day.

Mr. MAHONY.—Why is not some person from New South Wales to be appointed to the Trust?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I have previously pointed out that any man who is considered suitable for this particular work will be of very much more value in his own State than he would be on the central Trust. It is almost imperative that all the members of the Trust shall reside permanently in Melbourne. If they were living in any State other than Victoria, they would have to be travelling constantly between the different capitals in order to do their work as it should be done. In such circumstances it would be only reasonable that they should ask to be reimbursed their expenses, and we do not desire to fritter away any of this fund in that way. I do not believe that any of the trustees whom it is proposed to appoint will exhibit the slightest partiality. They will simply act on the recommendations received from the State Advisory Committees.

Mr. MAHONY.—How are these Committees to be appointed?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—In deference to a request preferred by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor), that some mention of these Committees should be made in the Bill, I have had a short clause drafted which will effect that object.

Mr. MAHONY.—It has not been circulated amongst honorable members.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—There are not many copies of it available at present, but at the proper time I will move for the insertion of a new clause, which will be known as 6A. In regard to the amendment of the honorable member for Darling, I again ask the Committee to allow the *personnel* of the central Trust to remain as it stands.

Mr. JAMES PAGE (Maranoa) [9.0].—I hope that the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) will not proceed with his amendment. We have already been informed that these positions are honorary, and my experience of honorary

bodies is that it is sometimes very difficult to obtain a quorum. It has been asked why there are not men and women appointed from other States besides Victoria; but if trustees have to be brought from a distance to Melbourne their expenses will have to be paid. For instance, if we had a representative from each State, the expenditure of a considerable amount of money would be involved; and we must not forget that this is not our own money, but the money of the soldiers themselves; indeed, I do not know that we have any right to dictate as to how this fund shall be spent. Many of the men whose names are mentioned are personally and deeply interested in the disposal of these funds, and, therefore, I suggest the withdrawal of the amendment.

Mr. LAZZARINI (Werriwa) [9.2].—On two or three occasions—at any rate, on two occasions—it has been stated by the Government that it is their definite intention to have representatives of the soldiers on the different Boards and Committees; but the Government always select the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League of Australia as the body to send the representatives. I do not object to a representative from that organization, but it seems to me that other organizations are deliberately ignored. As I have said previously, that organization is not the only one, nor can any member of it claim to represent the whole of the soldiers of Australia.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Can you name a more representative association?

Mr. LAZZARINI.—No; but I can name other organizations that are just as representative. The claim is made that this is the largest organization; but the fact that it has a few more members than others does not entitle it to be the only one to send representatives to such bodies. If this were the first occasion on which this has happened we might overlook it; but I am convinced that this association is singled out because of its political activities. That is a paltry attitude on the part of the Government when the soldiers' interests ought to be considered; but we find that political "pull" repeatedly. I know it is useless to move an amendment, so I shall satisfy myself with voicing my protest. The exercise of

discrimination in the way I have indicated is due to the fact that the officers of the organization stand behind the Nationalist Government in politics.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.5].—I think that the number of trustees might, with much advantage, be increased. I am not now saying whether or not the persons named are the proper persons for the position; but, in view of the fact that they will have the distribution of such a large sum of money, I think there ought to be more of them. Of the total sum of nearly £1,000,000, these trustees will control the allocation of possibly £600,000.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—It may be more.

Mr. TUDOR.—I hope it may be, because it is very much to be desired that others may follow the example of the executors under the McCaughey will. The number of trustees should be at least seven. As I have said on a previous occasion, I take no exception to the persons named, but I think it would be very advisable to have the names of two ladies added, seeing that the greater proportion of the work will be that of dealing with the claims of widows, widowed mothers, and children.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I hope the honorable member is not losing sight of the fact that the amendments that have been circulated mean the redrafting of the Bill since its introduction.

Mr. TUDOR.—I am glad that there is to be a Committee of three in each State. There can be no objection if the two ladies I suggest were selected from Victoria, though one might come from another State. The arrangements as to the Committees are left to regulations; but if we carry this clause in its present form, the trustees will be limited to seven, and an amending Bill would be required to add to the number. Would it be possible to add to the number of trustees by regulation?

Mr. GROOM.—No; a definite number is fixed by the clause, with power to fill vacancies that may occur.

Mr. TUDOR.—However that may be, I plead for the appointment of two ladies as additional trustees.

Amendment negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6 (Duties of trustees).

Mr. BLAKELEY (Darling) [9.11].—This is a further indication of the haphazard manner in which the Bill has been treated. The clause states that the trustees shall receive and consider applications from the widows and orphans and from widowed mothers and other dependants of deceased soldiers. As a matter of fact, this work will fall upon the State Advisory Committees, which will make recommendations to the trustees for indorsement.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 10 agreed to.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [9.15].—I move—

That the following new clause be inserted:—

- “6A. (1) For the purposes of this Act there shall be an Advisory Committee for each State.
- (2) Each Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the trustees.
- (3) The trustees shall nominate one member of each Advisory Committee, and the member so nominated shall be the chairman of the Committee.
- (4) An Advisory Committee shall advise the trustees upon matters referred to by the trustees, and shall carry out such duties in relation to the granting of assistance and benefits under this Act as the trustees direct.”

Mr. JAMES PAGE.—Why not stipulate the number to constitute each Advisory Committee?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The trustees will probably be in a better position to decide as to the number required, and, for that reason, we did not stipulate any particular number.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think it is advisable to provide that the number shall be not less than three, and that one at least shall be a woman. It must not be forgotten that the Advisory Committees will be dealing very largely with questions affecting widows and dependants of deceased soldiers.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—I accept the suggestion offered, and will amend sub-clause (1) of the proposed new clause to read—

(1) For the purposes of this Act there shall be an Advisory Committee of not less than three members, one of whom shall be a woman, for each State.

Proposed new clause, by leave, amended accordingly.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—There are women in New South Wales who have done excellent practical work among the soldiers. I have in mind, in particular, the splendid services of Mrs. Willie Chisholm, who conducted the rest camp at Kantara. Her activities were a godsend, not only to our soldiers, but to the “Tommies” as well. She was not one of those who merely visited the troops in hospital, and earned a lot of credit for having done war work in that way. Day after day, year in and year out, she did the real toil herself. I have seen her with her sleeves rolled up cooking. She and her assistants would cook thousands of eggs a day. She and one of her chief helpers, whom I recall at this moment, namely, Miss McPhillamy, spent four years of the best period of their lives, slaving like general servants in an hotel. Women of that type are deserving of all praise and every consideration. Personally, I am of opinion that the State Committees will number about five, with two women appointed to each.

Mr. MAHONY (Dalley) [9.22].—I am pleased that the suggestion has been accepted, and embodied in the proposed new clause. I desire to throw out the further suggestion that, in making the appointments, one of the women chosen should, if possible, represent that considerable section of the community which is composed of the working classes. Most of those who will seek help from this fund will be drawn from the ranks of the working classes, and it will be wise to place upon the Committees women who are in actual touch with the working people, who are in sympathy with them, and know their difficulties and conditions of life generally.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [9.24].—The proposal of the Government, as now set forth, is a step in the right direction, but I am not quite sure that it goes far enough. Honorable members who come from the more remote States are rather anxious concerning the manner in which the work of the Advisory Committees shall be done. We have had experience of the evil effects of centralization in Melbourne, not only in regard to the activities of different public administrations, but particularly concerning the work performed in connexion with our soldiers.

It is just possible that the trustees may take the view that they will be expected to keep a tight control of the purse. If that should be so, then, to a large extent, the work to be done under this measure will be seriously interfered with. I desire to make sure that a good deal of the actual allocation and distribution of the fund shall be intrusted to the State Committees. I do not like the name "Advisory Committee," because it suggests that these bodies will merely make recommendations to the central authority. If that is to be the practice, I can see considerable trouble in the matter of red-tape entanglements.

Mr. GROOM.—The honorable member should not overlook the phrase, "and shall carry out such duties in relation to the granting of assistance and benefits."

Mr. FOWLER.—There is undoubtedly power given the trustees to delegate their work to the Committees; but will they do so? I would like to see them give to the Committees a considerable share of the actual administrative duties in matters of detail, and merely exercise general control themselves. In Western Australia, it has been too often the case that organizations have been created with solely advisory powers. They have had to remit to Melbourne matters upon which they are really more competent to form judgment than the central authority; and thus time is wasted. He gives twice who gives quickly. In the case of many of the people to be benefited by the fund, the celerity with which assistance may be granted will constitute no small feature of the benefits themselves.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [9.28].—It is evident that public opinion is turning, and that, before long, ladies will be occupying seats in this House. If we can furnish some of these capable women with jobs outside, they may not be so anxious to get into this place, and put some honorable members out of a job. The decision of the Honorary Minister (Sir Granville Ryrie) to place women upon the controlling bodies is wise. I hope the political aspect will not be allowed to interfere with the choice of ladies upon the various Committees. I would like to see representatives chosen who will be closely identified with the "digger" and his dependants. With all due respect to those ladies whose names

have been mentioned, and against whom I have not a word to say, I am prepared to recommend one whom I have in mind—who will put her heart and soul into the work. She is closely and sympathetically identified with the soldier and his dependants, and knows their requirements. I endeavour to be just to all, but I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that I am a representative of the working classes of my constituency, and I trust that the Honorary Minister will arrange that some persons associated with trades halls or industrial unions are appointed on the State Advisory Committees. Dr. Mary Booth is an able woman anxious to get into the limelight, but she cannot be regarded as a representative of the industrial section. It is no use denying the fact that lady members of such Committees would act sympathetically towards the members of their own sex. I know what has taken place in the State I represent, and I have experienced sleepless nights because of the treatment meted out to widows in connexion with the administration of certain funds in that State. If the Government adopt the suggestion it will be the means of removing a good deal of discontent and bringing about harmonious conditions which are so necessary in connexion with an important work of this character.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [9.33].—I hope the Trust will at an early date allot the sum of money to be distributed in each State, and if that procedure is adopted its work will be considerably reduced. I am in accord with the view expressed by the honorable member for Perth (Mr. Fowler) that the State Advisory Committees should be given a fairly free hand in distributing the money allotted to each State. It should not be a difficult matter to ascertain the number of applicants and the approximate liabilities, and then allot the money accordingly so that each State Advisory Committee would have its share available for disposal.

Proposed new clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment; report adopted.

Standing Orders suspended.

Bill read a third time.

POSTPONEMENT OF JUDICIARY BILL.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) proposed—

That Order of the Day No. 3—Judiciary Bill 1920—be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [9.35].—I desire to ascertain the reason for altering the order of the business on the notice-paper?

Mr. GROOM.—It is our intention to go on with the Estimates.

Mr. RYAN.—If that is so, why has the order of business been presented in the form in which it appears on the notice-paper? The Judiciary Bill has appeared in its present position for the last two or three days, and now the Minister for Works and Railways has moved that the second reading be postponed to enable the Estimates to be considered. He has not had the courtesy to give any valid reason, but apparently the Government are not ready to go on with the Bill.

Mr. GROOM.—Yes, we are.

Mr. RYAN.—Then why not proceed?

Mr. GROOM.—Because the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) announced that certain Bills and the Estimates were to be proceeded with.

Mr. RYAN.—I know that it is convenient for the Government to proceed with the Estimates when they have no other business on hand, and that is apparently the position in which they now find themselves. I object to the order of business being altered in this way, and I trust the Minister will reconsider the matter. Is not the Minister prepared to move the second reading to-night?

Mr. GROOM.—We are going on with the Estimates.

Mr. RYAN.—The Government with their majority will doubtless be able to do as they desire, but a more satisfactory reason should be given for altering the order of business. It is true that the Prime Minister stated that certain measures were to be dealt with, but that does not necessitate this procedure. The Judiciary Bill is a measure on which I think an amendment should be moved to enable the House to deal with the question of profiteering, which is a most pressing problem. On a measure such as the Judiciary Bill we shall be able to

confer on the High Court or some other tribunal the necessary powers to deal with profiteering, and for that reason I trust the House will insist on the present order of business being adhered to. I intend to move an amendment for the withdrawal of the Bill to enable a more comprehensive measure to be introduced at the earliest possible moment. The urgency of dealing with profiteering is of such importance that we must not lose any opportunity of doing all we can to enable the House to come to a decision. I oppose the motion, and take this opportunity of informing the Minister that when the second reading is moved it is my intention to submit an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order! The honorable member will not be entitled at this stage to deal with his proposed amendments of the Judiciary Bill.

Mr. RYAN.—I am going to connect them with my reasons for not approving of the proposal to alter the order of business on the notice-paper.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think the honorable member will be in order in indicating the nature of the amendments he proposes to move to the Judiciary Bill.

Mr. RYAN.—I am entitled to give the reasons why I do not want the order of business to be altered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is so; but only within the limits before the Chair.

Mr. RYAN.—I object to the alteration of the order of business because of the urgency of conferring upon the High Court of Australia and other Courts jurisdiction to deal with the question of profiteering, or at all events, to carry out investigations, and to enforce penalties which will be provided in measures, within the scope of the Constitution, requiring statistics to be given of the manufacturing cost of all goods produced in Australia and of the landed cost of all imported goods. I desire, also, to have conferred upon them power to enforce penalties that will be provided in measures requiring statistics to be given of the profits made in the Inter-State shipping trade.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member will not be in order in proceeding

along those lines. The only question before the Chair is a motion to postpone a certain order of the day.

Mr. RYAN.—I am showing why I object to its postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am loth to interrupt the honorable member, but he is now referring to the Judiciary Bill, and indicating amendments thereto which he intends to move. As an old parliamentarian he must know that he is not in order in dealing with such matters on the motion now before the Chair.

Mr. RYAN.—I have no desire to go beyond the Standing Orders in debating this question. I feel, however, that to discuss it intelligently I must give the reasons why I think the order of business on the notice-paper should not be departed from. It is of the utmost urgency that this House should take steps to pass measures that will enable us to effectively deal with profiteering under the powers contained in the Constitution. It is of the utmost urgency that we should confer upon the High Court and other Courts jurisdiction to enforce the penalties provided by those measures and to carry out the investigations necessary in relation to them. I am certain that the people of Australia agree with me that this is a matter of extreme urgency. No one could have sat in the galleries during the last few days, and have listened to the talk that has been going on without coming to the conclusion that there is some justification for referring to the Parliament as "a mere talking shop." We are dealing with matters which do not affect the real interests of the people, which should be receiving our consideration. The Tariff, for instance, is before us. We know that there are complaints that locally manufactured goods are sold at prices higher than are justified by the cost of production, and we are told that this is due to the fact that a high Tariff has been introduced. By all means, then, let us exercise as soon as possible our power to call for statistics showing the cost of manufacturing goods, and confer on the Courts the jurisdiction to enforce such requirements. That is a matter of extreme urgency.

Mr. STEWART.—Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN.—I am sure that my honorable friends of the Country party will

agree with me, and I am glad to note that one of them, by interjection, has already done so. Measures of the sort to which I have referred, are of far greater urgency than the matters to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) has referred. I am prepared to agree to the House meeting not only every Tuesday as an extra sitting day, but also on Mondays, in order to have such measures passed. They are the kind of measures for which the people of Australia are looking. The people are looking to this Parliament to do something to put down profiteering, but the Parliament is doing nothing. Not only is it doing nothing, but we have the Prime Minister telling us that we can do nothing—that the National Parliament is utterly helpless to do anything in connexion with the most important question that is affecting the minds of the people to-day. We can do something, and ought to do something. The matter is of urgency. It is within our power to do something, and surely honorable members are not going to agree to a proposal by the Ministry to alter the order of business on the notice-paper so that we may proceed with the consideration of the Estimates, in order to fill in time, when other questions of greater urgency await our attention. I for one enter my protest, and I propose to divide the House upon the question. I hope that other honorable members will take exception to the alteration of the order of business in this way, and that a majority will vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Minister for the Navy) [9.46].—The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) will, of course, divide the House. He has been dividing it ever since he entered it.

Several honorable members interjecting,

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—The Minister for the Navy had not spoken half-a-dozen words before he was subjected to a chorus of shouted interjections. I ask honorable members to cease the practice. Unless they do so, some other means to which I do not desire to resort will have to be adopted to secure the orderly conduct of business.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I have a distinct recollection of the honorable member dividing the House a little while ago

on the very question of the urgency of the Estimates, and the necessity for this House taking control of the finances of the country. I think the honorable member made that the ground of a vote of censure on the Government. He wanted them to discuss nothing but the Estimates.

Mr. RYAN.—That is not true. Show me in *Hansard* the report of such a statement made by me.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I did not say that the honorable member said it; I said he voted for it. He insisted that the one thing that this House must do was to restore its control over the finances of the country. He now ridicules the very idea of such a thing. The consideration of the Estimates, he says, is a waste of time. On the occasion to which I refer nothing was more urgent than the consideration of the Estimates. Now he tells us it is not urgent. A month later and it becomes of no urgency—it is the least urgent matter on the business-paper—and the honorable member will have nothing whatever to do with the consideration of the finances or the Estimates before the House. Which of these attitudes is the correct one? Either the honorable member was playing a part then or he is playing one now. Then it was “yes” for the Estimates; now it is “no” for the Estimates.

Mr. STEWART.—He did not advocate that the Government should bring on the Estimates whenever they wanted to fill in time.

Mr. MAHONY.—That is an aerial torpedo.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It is the sort of interjection that one expects from the honorable member for Wimmera (Mr. Stewart). If there is in the Corner party one honorable member who ever since he has been in the House has been less of a Country member and more of a Labour member, it is the honorable member who now interjects.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—More honour to him!

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—If it is an honour, then he is entitled to it. The honorable member for Wimmera is certainly one of the best friends of the Opposition. He has, of course, the right to make whatever interjection he pleases. I merely point to the fact that the consideration of the Estimates a month ago was, in the opinion of the honorable

member for West Sydney, of the greatest possible urgency, whereas to-night it is of no consequence whatever. A complete change has come over the scene. The Government are doing merely what every other Government have done since responsible government was established. They are exercising their right to control their own business, and put their measures before Parliament in the order in which they think they should be considered.

Mr. WEST.—And we claim our right to dictate and tell the Government what they ought to do.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No doubt, the dictators are on the other side; but I sincerely hope that the Government have not reached the stage at which they may be dictated to as to the order in which Government business shall be done. They will certainly not allow the honorable member for West Sydney to take the conduct of the business of this House out of their hands.

Why does the honorable member propose to take this course? Does he for a moment imagine that, by anything which he may do with the Judiciary Bill, he will confer powers on this Parliament which are not in the Constitution to deal with the great question of profiteering. The honorable member knows better, in my judgment, and he is merely adopting this course as a means to upset the Government by a side wind.

Mr. RYAN.—I think that means should be adopted to check profiteering.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman knows just how to deal with that question. Nobody else in the world knows how to deal with it; but, apparently, he does. He is the one man in all the world who can deal with it.

Mr. GROOM.—He had the opportunity, but did not do so.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The Queensland statute-book shows that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order!

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to be allowed to make an interjection now and again.

Mr. FENTON.—The Minister is putting up a “stone-wall.”

Mr. BLAKELEY.—The honorable gentleman is “stone-walling” the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member for Darling is out of order.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I know that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member must obey the call of the Chair to keep order.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—On a previous occasion the honorable member for West Sydney, in his efforts to upset the Government, wanted to deal with the Estimates on the ground that their immediate consideration was urgent; and to-night, when the Government propose to proceed with the consideration of the Estimates, he adopts another course, and tries to upset the Government by taking the conduct of the business out of their hands.

Mr. RYAN.—I invited the Minister for Works and Railways (Mr. Groom) to leave the business-paper as it was.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The Government believe that they are doing their duty in submitting the Estimates for the consideration of the House.

Mr. RYAN.—I conceive that I am doing my duty in protesting against profiteering, and in asking that a stop shall be put to it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member keeps on saying "profiteering," and makes himself believe that the matter is twice as bad as it is, and that he is the one man born into the world to set it right. I wish that he could set it right. It is a pity that the honorable gentleman did not set it right when he had the power, as Premier of Queensland.

Mr. RYAN.—I tried, as far as possible, to do so.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman did, and he sent the cost of living in Queensland soaring up 60 or 70 per cent. He dislocated the finances of that State. His muddling hand has left Queensland in the throes of greater difficulties than exist in any other State in the group.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable gentleman is not discussing the question before the Chair.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I think you are right, sir. I hope that the honorable member for West Sydney will not persist in this course of action. The Government cannot consent to what he proposes.

Mr. RYAN.—I make up my mind before I start.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I congratulate my honorable friend on having a mind to make up. May I say that the Government made up their mind from the start.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.54].—The Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) has said that honorable members on this side moved a motion of censure on the Government for failing to bring on the consideration of the Estimates. We did no such thing. The motion referring to the consideration of the Estimates was submitted by a member of the Country party.

Mr. GROOM.—Honorable members opposite voted for it, did they not?

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes, we did; but the only motion of censure that has so far been moved in this Parliament was one which I had the honour of moving, and it dealt with the very matter about which the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has spoken to-night, namely, the failure of the Government to deal with profiteering. It dealt also with their muddling of the finances, and the way in which they controlled the wheat and other Pools. Speaking from memory, there were the three heads on which my motion of censure was based. When the Treasurer (Mr. Watt) proposed that the House should go into Committee of Supply, the honorable member for West Sydney discussed, as he has done to-night, the power of the Commonwealth to deal with profiteering under the existing Constitution. We voted with honorable members in the Corner, as we naturally would, in order to shift the Government upon any consideration. I am perfectly frank in making that admission. The Government know it to be a fact.

Mr. MAXWELL.—The honorable gentleman is always "Frank."

Mr. TUDOR.—I suppose that is why my parents christened me as they did. The Government last night made up the business-paper, and, as has always been done, informed the Clerk of the House of the order in which they intended to bring forward their business to-day. What has happened to account for their desire to change that order? They got the Canteens Funds Bill through sooner than they expected—

Mr. BRENNAN.—Because we helped them more than they expected.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; and have succeeded in making the Bill a much better measure than it was when it was introduced.

Mr. RILEY.—Get on to profiteering; that is what we want to prevent.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister for the Navy stated that when the honorable member for West Sydney was Premier of Queensland the cost of living soared in that State, but why will he not give us an opportunity to discover whether we have the power to deal with profiteering? There have been cases waiting for consideration by the High Court for months. The ex-member for Ballarat (Mr. McGrath) has presented a petition against the continuance in this House of an honorable member who was returned by a majority of one vote. That case has been held over for months. But when the totalisator people were affected, the High Court was called together on the Monday and gave its decision on the Tuesday.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I hope that the honorable gentleman does not suggest that the Government had anything to do with that?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not; but the High Court could be moved to deal at once with the proposal to tax totalisator dividends whilst it cannot be moved to consider the case of a humble citizen of the Commonwealth.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Moved by whom?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not say that it was moved by the Government to consider the totalisator tax.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Nor by anybody on behalf of the Government.

Mr. TUDOR.—I admit that; but I am pointing out that, apparently, certain persons have a readier means of access to the High Court than have certain other persons.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order! The honorable member is departing from the question.

Mr. TUDOR.—What I have said might be a little off the track, but I am very glad that I got it in. Only recently I told the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), in connexion with arbitration matters, that organizations that are content to wait the convenience of the Court are allowed to wait, and organizations that go on strike secure a decision from the Court earlier than do law-abiding citizens. The Estimates are always useful to mark time; but I am very anxious that the Government shall see what powers they have to prevent profiteering. Under the War Precautions Act they had complete powers,

and if they are sincere in their professed desire to reduce the high cost of living, which is affecting the whole of the people of the Commonwealth, they should at least try how far their existing powers will permit them to go in the prevention of profiteering. If they are held up by the Court, they may learn that their powers are not as extensive as they thought they were.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member think that we have power to deal with these questions?

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member for Darling Downs (Mr. Groom) introduced, during the absence from Australia of the Minister for the Navy, a Bill empowering this Parliament to regulate transactions in wheat, wool, sugar, butter, and flax for terms varying from six months to two or three years, and if we had power to deal with those commodities for a certain length of time, we have power to deal with other commodities for longer periods. It is for the Government to show that they are in earnest in preventing the people from being robbed by the profits levied by the number of persons who now handle the goods that are consumed. I believe that the Government can do more than has been done, and it is for them to do more.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [10.3].—I ask the Government which, in the interest of the country, is the more important business—the consideration of Estimates which cover money most of which has been spent, or a Bill to give power to deal with the cost of living?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The Estimates have to be put through.

Mr. RILEY.—They will go through.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Why not put them through to-night, and be done with them?

Mr. RILEY.—They are being brought forward to-night merely as a stop-gap, because the Government has no business to proceed with. I have seen Estimates like these passed in half-an-hour. I hope that the electors will mark what has happened to-night. Members are here ready to do business, and the country is clamouring for Parliament to pass certain legislation, yet the Government does nothing. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), when setting forth the manifesto of the Nationalist party at Bendigo, said that he would kill the profiteer. He did not say that he had not statutory power to do that.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—He said that he would kill him if he could catch him.

Mr. RILEY.—The Nationalists are not trying to catch him; they are trying to cover up his tracks. We have a right to demand the fulfilment of the Government's promises. Since they took office, the country has suffered a great deal of damage. Bread has increased by 2d. a loaf, and the price of sugar has risen to 6d. per lb.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Have the measures which we have passed for the benefit of our returned soldiers damaged the country?

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—I cannot permit the discussion to continue with the extremely wide range that is developing. This is not the Address-in-Reply debate, and the introduction of so many irrelevant subjects is quite irregular. The question before the Chair is whether Order of the Day No. 3 shall be postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. RILEY.—I shall endeavour to comply with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. By not going on with the Bill set down for to-night, the Government is prolonging the life of the profiteer. In reply to the interjection of the Minister for the Navy, I say that the money that we are spending on repatriation is benefiting the profiteer. Last week, I was present at the opening of some war service homes. The timber, bricks, and other material in those buildings had cost hundreds of pounds more than they should have cost, because of the exactions of the profiteer.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Because of the strikes, about which Labour members never say a word.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I ask the honorable member for Wakefield not to interrupt. I must insist upon every member being heard without such continued interruption as is now taking place. Interjections often lead to the discussion of irrelevant subjects, and that causes me to intervene and call the member addressing the Chair to order. I hope that honorable members will assist the Chair by conserving for members their right to be heard with a reasonable amount of silence.

Mr. RILEY.—We shall assist the soldiers if we prevent the profiteer from fleecing them. At present, they are paying 50 per cent. more for their homes than similar buildings would have cost before the war, and that notwithstanding

the fact that we produce our own bricks and grow our own timber. It is for this reason that we desire that the power shall be given to the High Court, or some other authority, to deal with the profiteer. I am pleased that the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has called the attention of the country to the fact that the Government is neglecting its duty by allowing the profiteer to continue in existence. Almost every item of food-stuffs and clothing has increased in price by nearly 50 per cent. since this Government was returned to power, and Ministers have done nothing to prevent it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—John Storey said that he would deal with the profiteer in forty-eight hours if he were returned to power.

Mr. RILEY.—The Minister for the Navy, and all the followers of the Prime Minister, backed up his statement that it is the duty of the Government to kill the profiteer, but I have not heard of any funeral. Some of them said they would shoot him; but no one has been shot. I hope that the people will soon have another opportunity to declare their views. Now that the Prime Minister has entered the chamber, I would remind him of his Bendigo utterances. The Prime Minister said that he was out to fight the profiteer tooth and claw. I now ask him to assist us to give the High Court power to deal with the profiteer.

Mr. HUGHES.—Who put the honorable member up to this?

Mr. RILEY.—I was elected to this Parliament to fight the profiteers, and I am trying to do so. Unfortunately, they have too many supporters on the Government side, but the time will come when we shall have an opportunity of dealing with this problem.

Mr. LAZZARINI (Werriwa) [10.11].—I rise to create a few more laughs on the Government benches by opposing the proposal of the Government to transfer to a lower position on the business-sheet an important measure like the Judiciary Bill by an amendment of which we might be able to deal with the question of profiteering which has been agitating the public mind almost since the commencement of the war. The Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) has repeated the argument used by other members on the Government side that this Parliament has no power to do what is proposed.

The Judiciary Bill provides an opportunity of getting the power. It is upon this very question of profiteering, and not upon the delay in dealing with the Estimates, that the party on this side made a motion of censure upon the Government. If at election time it was necessary to deal with profiteering, it is much more necessary to do so now. Every day the prices of commodities are rising. As the honorable member for South Sydney (Mr. Riley) has pointed out, we have, in connexion with the Repatriation scheme, made provision for erecting soldiers' homes, and each day that we delay dealing with the profiteer must mean the expenditure of more money for this purpose, because of the capitalistic interests continually raising the prices of building material. Perhaps the Government realize that by a specific amendment to the Judiciary Bill we could test whether Ministerialists were earnest in their assertions that they wished to deal with the profiteer. If the Government wish to prevent the masses of the people being pushed lower and lower down the economic scale on to and even below the bread line until something very serious happens, they must take some measures to cope with this problem. Here is their opportunity. We have heard speeches in regard to industrial unrest and the seething discontent in the rank and file of the Labour organizations. What but profiteering and the resultant high cost of living is responsible? Each day the wages of the workers diminish in purchasing power. As men sink lower in their economic status the discontent becomes greater, and unless conditions are improved this country must expect serious trouble. Even one of the lower animals will fight when it is hungry; will man do less? Honorable members on this side would be unfaithful to their election pledges, to the trust which the people reposed in them, and to the dictates of humanity and common justice if they did not make a protest against the action of the Government in cavalierly pushing into the background a measure that would enable them to do some of the things which they told the people they would do. I admit it would be impossible to provide in the Bill for the shooting of the profiteer, but it would be possible to embody in the measure sufficient power to check his depredations.

Mr. Lazzarini.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson)—Order! The honorable member must not discuss the Judiciary Bill, which is not before the House.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—If the Government wish the Opposition to give fair and reasonable consideration to the measures they bring forward, they should not play with us as they are attempting to do to-night.

Mr. MAHONY (Dalley) [10.19].—It must be at once apparent to any honorable member that the only purpose that the Government desire to serve in changing the order of business is the wasting of time. Having been caught with no business ready to be proceeded with they are adopting the tactics often resorted to by Governments in the past of throwing on the table old Estimates, the votes in which have been almost exhausted. They ask honorable members to discuss the Estimates, not one line of which can be altered, because the money is already spent. The thing is a sheer piece of humbug and sham, and it is about time the country realized what a humbugging sham and make-believe the present Government are. They came into power with a great flourish of trumpets. They were going to kill the profiteer. They were going to wipe out all those things that were oppressing the people, and make Australia safe for Democracy. Now comes the humbugging sham of it all, that they ask us to discuss Estimates when the money has all been spent, and propose to take away from us the opportunity of discussing the Judiciary Bill, under which we could give power to the High Court, by reinforcing it and extending its operations, to go into various businesses, investigate them thoroughly, make those conducting them produce their figures, and show their profits, and what it cost them to produce an article, what they are selling it to the consumer for, and what huge bank balances and profits they are building up for themselves. The Government make no attempt to do this, or to carry out their election pledges, or the platform which they asked the people of this country to give them a mandate to put into effect. They ask us to postpone the very measure under which they might get the power to do the things which the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) said the Government

would do. It is about time his sham and hypocrisy was exposed to the people. We should show the people that the Government have no intention to deal with profiteering except to bolster up and make more safe and secure the position of the robber and profiteer in Australia. The members of this House should not be caught with that humbug and sham on the part of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—Order! The honorable member is not entitled to use such language.

Mr. MAHONY.—The language may not be quite in accordance with parliamentary usage, but there is not the slightest doubt that the action of the Government in deliberately running away from the one measure on the business-paper that could deal with profiteering is a clear proof that they are a Government of hypocrites and shams.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I ask the honorable member to withdraw those expressions, which are quite unparliamentary.

Mr. MAHONY.—I withdraw them in deference to your instruction, sir. The only other way by which I can express my feelings towards the Government is to say that they are sitting on the Treasury bench under false pretences. They obtained a majority in the House by telling the people that they were going to deal with profiteering, and lift the great burden that was pressing the people down. We find them to-day neglecting to do this, and postponing the very measure that might give them power to do it. I hope the opportunity will be taken almost immediately of having a vote on this question, so that the people may know where the members of the House stand on it. I strongly support the view put forward by the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan).

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND (Illawarra) [10.25].—I have yet to learn that the Judiciary Bill proposes to deal with profiteering, and I am a little surprised that the advent of the Labour Government in New South Wales should so soon be followed by the anxious demands of New South Wales members that this Parliament should deal with profiteering. I am also surprised at the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan), who did

all he could only a few months ago to prevent this Parliament having the power to deal with profiteering, should be so concerned about the matter now.

Mr. BRENNAN.—That is a good old gag.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—It is a good old gag, and a true old gag. But for the efforts of the honorable member for West Sydney and others of the Labour party who associated themselves with him in opposition to the referenda proposals, they would have been carried, and this Parliament would have had the power to deal with the profiteer without question. But because the proposals came from this side of the House they did their utmost to prevent this Parliament having the power which they now say it ought to have. They did not do this because they believed that the proposals were ineffective to deal with profiteering, for many of them had already made every effort to secure the adoption of those amendments on previous occasions; but they turned their backs upon what they had done then, and on the last occasion they opposed those proposals which before they had declared to be necessary to give this Parliament power to do the things which they now say ought to be done.

Mr. GABB.—Is that the truth?

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—It is. I do not recognise in the honorable member a very good judge of that quality.

Mr. GABB.—You must have been at Ananias' school.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! Such suggestions are distinctly offensive. I ask honorable members not to interject across the chamber.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND. — The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), at the earnest request of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor), yesterday outlined the business which Parliament was expected to do before it rose for the reception of the Prince. The time to have taken exception to those measures was then; but I did not hear any objection at the time. It has been suddenly discovered that the chance of having a full-dress debate upon the pet subject of the honorable member for West Sydney has been missed. I hope we shall be able to get on with the Estimates. I can still hear the protests of

honorable members opposite that the Estimates come to us too late. I am also a little surprised at some of the members in the Ministerial corner, who scorn to consider so small a proposition as one-sixth of the Commonwealth expenditure.

Mr. ROBERT COOK.—Never mind the corner; it will take you all your time to mind yourself.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—There are still two months of the period covered by the Estimates to run, and the expenditure of the Commonwealth is a pretty considerable sum.

Honorable members interjecting.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! Again I ask honorable members to cease this loud conversation.

Honorable members again interjecting.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) is out of order.

Mr. FENTON.—Who is making "this 'ere row"?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I have several times asked honorable members to keep order, and they have consistently interrupted immediately after the House has been called to order. Honorable members should have more regard for their own reputations and the dignity of the Chamber of which they are members, and uphold the Chair in its efforts to carry out the rules of debate as laid down by their own Standing Orders. I have no desire to proceed to extreme measures, but honorable members will force me to do so unless they abide by our Standing Orders and obey the call of the Chair.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—There still remain two months of the present financial year, and the expenditure for those months covers practically every Department of government. The criticisms, therefore, in which honorable members opposite are so anxious to indulge can be made just as effectively upon these Estimates as they can be in any other way. I hope that the resolution will be carried.

Mr. BLAKELEY (Darling) [10.32].—I remember that in pre-war days it was a privilege to hear the honorable member for Illawarra (Mr. Hector Lamond) attacking. Many a fight he has put up at our industrial conferences. I regret

to say that since then he has gone over to the profiteers, and that, as a defender of the profiteers' party, he is a dismal failure.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—I rise to a point of order. I submit that the honorable member is not in order in saying that I am a member of the profiteers' party. I am not. I hold the same views in regard to profiteers that I have always held, though some honorable members opposite have changed their opinions.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—The only question before the Chair is that the consideration of the Judiciary Bill be postponed until after the consideration of the Estimates, and I ask honorable members to confine themselves to that.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—It would be funny if it were not so pathetic to listen to the honorable member for Illawarra—

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I ask the honorable member to discuss the question that is before the Chair.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—When dealing with profiteering the honorable member for Illawarra stated that were it not for the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) and the Labour party generally succour would be given to the people of Australia.

Mr. HECTOR LAMOND.—The Labour party generally are opposed to the honorable member for West Sydney.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—One can take with a grain of salt the protestations of the honorable member. Despite his past record we now see him at the head of the enemy, leading the profiteers. Of course, I recognise that the Government occupy a very unhappy position. I can quite appreciate their uneasiness. Since the opening of this Parliament they have been defeated no less than four or five times, and they would have been beaten even more frequently but for the action of certain members of the Country party. I can readily understand, therefore, that Ministers have very little time to devote to the preparation of Bills. They are too busy. Only last week notice was given of their intention to deal with no less than seven measures. Mention was made of an amendment of the Arbitration Act—a long-looked-for measure. Then a Bill has been promised to finalize the secret negotiations for dealing with

Papuan oil. I will not discuss the merits of that question at this juncture. Another promised measure is an Indemnity Bill, which is not yet ready, and which has probably not even been drafted. There is also a Bill to authorize the creation of a Bureau of Science and Industry, which has been held over for the past two years. There is the much-mutilated Repatriation Bill, which has been forwarded from the Senate with the compliments of that branch of the Legislature. Perhaps the Government, after a whip of their party, do not feel that they are in a position to do very much. They may be anxious to avoid the consideration of any measure of a contentious character. Certainly they have done surprisingly little to give effect to the many pledges which they recently made to the people. Although the members of the Country party have saved the Government on many occasions, I have not the slightest doubt that the time will come—and probably before some honorable members expect it—when their small majority will disappear, and they will go out of office. It is because of their uneasiness that they are not ready to proceed with business, and that they now wish to put before us Estimates for the financial year which has almost expired, much as a person throws a bone to a dog in order to keep its attention off something else.

Mr. MAKIN (Hindmarsh) [10.40].—There are two questions of paramount importance which should have engaged the attention of this House long ere this. These concern industrial unrest, and an amendment in the Arbitration Act, and profiteering, and the promised measure to deal with it. We doubted the sincerity of the Government when the appeal was made to the electors in December last, and that doubt has been justified by the attitude of the Government towards profiteering, especially since the elections. We find that they are prepared to place the promised measure lower down on the business-paper, although it is a measure that would doubtless have some control over the present unjustifiable inflation of prices. I represent a constituency composed almost entirely of members of the working community, and I can say that they are beginning to

despair, owing to the circumstances of their life at the present time. They recognise that the present Government can offer them no hope for the future—that no attempt is being made to deal with those individuals who are reducing the life of the country to a dull, sordid, soulless existence. It is about time that we, as the custodians of the welfare of the people, recognised where our duty lies to those people who are suffering so much at the present time; but profiteering goes on, and the toll extracted by the barons of industry from the unprotected people is represented by big dividends. The interests of the great working community ought to be protected, and we on this side of the House, without any desire to embarrass the Government, are endeavouring to impress on them the necessity there is to deal with those people who are making such inroads on the welfare of the public.

Mr. RYAN.—And deal with them at once.

Mr. MAKIN.—Exactly; indeed, they should have been dealt with long ago. The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) generously offered to the Government to draft a Bill which would be within the existing powers under the Constitution, and enable them to deal with the profiteers, who are the greatest traitors any country could have. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), in a speech made at a National Federation meeting in the Athenæum Hall, Melbourne, stated that the problem of the profiteer was a baffling one; but no attempt has been made by the Government to solve the problem. On the contrary, there seems to be a systematic desire on the part of the Government to protect profiteers in their successful efforts at exploitation.

People may ask what is the cause of the industrial unrest; but it requires only the application of a little common sense to find it.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The wonder is that there is so little.

Mr. MAKIN.—Under our economic circumstances, that is the wonder. I represent a working constituency, and as one who has worked at the bench, I have been subject to such hardships as are now being suffered by the people at large. It ill-becomes any honorable member to do anything that will defer the day when

something can be done to remove the disabilities created by the profiteer. The protest made by the honorable member for West Sydney and others is well justified. The Government will have to be taught their duty; and we on this side would fail as representatives if we did not call the attention of the country at large to the fact that little or nothing has been done to remove the conditions which allow the great commercial and financial interests to extract further profits from the community. I hope that honorable members opposite will see the necessity for immediate action, and will be able to say, when they are called upon to give an account of their stewardship, that they did all in their power to relieve the present situation as it affects the masses of the population. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) may argue that he has no power to deal with profiteering; but the honorable member for West Sydney states that, to his knowledge, the difficulty can be overcome; and there is no reason why his assistance should not be accepted. There is no reasonable excuse for allowing this matter to remain in abeyance, and we ought to ascertain at once how far we can render the necessary assistance.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY (Hume) [10.50].—The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) is to be congratulated for having drawn the attention of the House and the country to the action of the Government in connexion with this matter. If ever there was a Government of which it could be said that they are doing nothing, and doing it well, it is this Government. It is really pitiable to see the manner in which they are delaying business by bringing on the Estimates to deal with money which has already been spent.

Mr. POYNTON.—We are not so bad as the Government with which you were once associated. The Estimates then came on in the following year.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I was never connected with any Government with which the Minister for Home and Territories also was not associated.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am referring to that Government.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—Then the Minister must accept his own share of condemnation. In any case, it is a poor

excuse to point to the misdeeds of any other Government in order to explain away the shortcomings of the present Government. In connexion with the introduction of the Judiciary Bill, I see important possibilities, to some of which the honorable member for West Sydney has referred. There is, first of all, the question of jurisdiction being given to the High Court to deal not only with profiteering, but with many other matters that are demanding urgent attention at the present time. The Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook), when an honorable member of the Corner party was speaking, referred to him as a Labour man having Labour sympathies. It is infinitely better for any honorable member to express Labour sympathies than to be the friend of profiteers.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—The Minister did make use of that expression, though he denies it now, and I can assure him that people outside will not find fault with any honorable member of this House who expresses sympathy with the Labour movement and with people who are struggling against the high cost of living. It has been said that this Parliament has no power to deal with profiteering, but in this connexion I refer honorable members to an article that appeared in the *Age* newspaper on Monday last. I presume the *Age* acted on good legal advice when it made the statement. Dealing with the Tariff issue, and in answer to complaints by those people who say that the new Tariff will increase the cost of living, and that this Parliament has no power to deal with the profiteers, the *Age* said—

The Commonwealth can, under its powers with regard to statistics, estimate the manufacturing costs so as to ascertain what is a fair margin of profit over and above cost of production.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. Elliot Johnson).—The honorable member must connect his remarks with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I intend to do so. There is extensive power to deal with profiteering, and, according to the *Age*, the Government can, under its taxation powers, "limit" profits to a "fair and reasonable level."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member is not in order in discussing

generally the subject of profiteering, though he may incidentally refer to it if he can connect his remarks with the Judiciary Bill, consideration of which it is proposed to postpone till to-morrow.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I intend to connect my remarks with the Judiciary Bill, Mr. Speaker, but it would have been impossible to do so without making the quotation. We were looking for this Judiciary Bill, so that we would be able to confer certain necessary powers on the High Court.

Mr. TUDOR.—Sir John Quick made the same statement during the last election.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—That is so. I listened with interest to the speech made by the honorable member for Illawarra (Mr. Hector Lamond), who to-night was apologizing for the profiteers. I regret that he is not present now, so that I might reply to his remarks. There was a time when he held other views.

Mr. POYNTON.—He never did anything of the kind.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I am putting my own interpretation on his speech. The honorable member for Illawarra, like the Minister, was at one time on this side of the House. We were led to believe that they parted with the Labour party over the conscription issue; but it appears now that they have gone over to the other side on other questions as well, for we now find the honorable member for Illawarra apologizing for a number of things that were once anathema to him. He and the Minister for Home and Territories (Mr. Foynton) have, it appears, run away from their life-long principles. However, I will leave that aspect of the matter now, for the simple reason that the honorable member for Illawarra is not in the House. As regards the Judiciary Bill, I have every sympathy with what is proposed to be done; but there should be scope to deal with many other matters, including one in which I have a particular interest. I desire to see jurisdiction given to the High Court in regard to the extension of the moratorium.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I cannot permit the honorable member to proceed. He will not be in order in following up the line of argument upon which he is now entering.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I submit to your ruling, sir; but I am only endeavouring to show reasons why the Judiciary Bill should be brought forward for consideration; and if I may do so by pointing out how, through that measure, profiteering may be dealt with, surely I would be in order in pointing out, also, that the Judiciary Bill is equally necessary to deal with another important subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! I have allowed a great deal more latitude than I should have done, and must accept my share of blame for not having prevented the development of this discussion at an earlier stage. I ask the honorable member now to concentrate his attention upon the question before the Chair, and so avoid dragging in extraneous and irrelevant subjects.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I must confess that I was hoping that, by means of the Judiciary Bill, something would be done to give relief to unfortunate people who are carrying heavy mortgages to-day in drought-stricken areas.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member is now disregarding my ruling, and is proceeding to discuss the Judiciary Bill, which is not before the House.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I submit to your ruling, sir; but with all deference repeat that if, in connexion with the Judiciary Bill, I may touch upon its relevance to the subject of profiteering I should be permitted to mention also its relation to the matter of the extension of the moratorium. I marvel every day at the fact that many unfortunate people are able to live at all. They are only existing. The Government say they have no power to deal with profiteering. The honorable member for West Sydney has offered to draft a Bill. Why do not the Government accept that offer? If the honorable member should fail, the Government ought to be only too glad to have given him the opportunity to demonstrate his failure. The honorable member for West Sydney not only undertakes to draft the Bill, but will guarantee its validity before the Courts. That is both a fair offer and a fair challenge. The honorable member for Illawarra remarked to-night that honorable members on this side had prevented the taking of an affirmative vote in

connexion with the last referendum, and that if a "Yes" vote had been recorded the Government would have done certain things by this time to stop profiteering. At a meeting of representatives of the Housewives Association, about a fortnight ago, the Prime Minister is reported to have used these words in answer to the question, "What would have been done if the referendum was carried?" "By this time," said Mr. Hughes, "we would have had a Commission appointed in order to make these inquiries." It would appear that all the Government proposed was to add another to the list of Commissions which are merely tampering with the subject to-day. There is a body known as the Fair Prices Commission. Any one, upon reading the evidence given before it, must be convinced that it is only tinkering with profiteering and the cost of living. There is evidence every day to prove that profiteering is rampant; yet the Prime Minister said that what the Government would have done, had the people voted "Yes," would have been to appoint a Commission.

Mr. WISE.—The Prime Minister never said such a thing, and the honorable member knows it.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—I am going upon the report of the Prime Minister's remarks. If the only outcome of the referendum was to have been the appointment of another Commission, nobody should be sorry now that the "No" vote succeeded. This House is to meet

on Tuesday next. Why this extra day? It is a mere blind to make the people think we have something important in hand. Why should this House proceed with such a farce? Why should honorable members be called upon to meet a day earlier, if the Government have no more important business to place before them than the consideration of Estimates, the money involved in which has been practically all spent? The opportunity to expose the Government as the friends of the profiteers has been too long allowed to pass. Of course, the Government will not deal with profiteering, for the reason that they would not have been back on the Treasury benches to-day but for the help of the campaign funds provided by the profiteers. I trust even now that the Government will recognise the seriousness of the position and attempt to provide relief for the struggling people, who look to this Parliament to conserve their interests against their enemies, the profiteers.

Mr. CONSIDINE (Barrier) [11.8].—I desire to add my protest to the action of the Government in "side-tracking" the Judiciary Bill. Nobody on this side of the House, of course, believes that the Government intend to do anything to interfere with the profits of those people who made it possible for the Government to get back to the Treasury benches. I ask leave to continue my remarks upon another occasion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Members of the House of Representatives.

Speaker—The Honorable William Elliot Johnson.

Chairman of Committees—The Honorable John Moore Chanter.

Anstey, Frank ..	Bourke (V.)	Johnson, Hon. William Lang (N.S.W.)
Atkinson, Llewelyn ..	Wilmot (T.)	Elliot
Bamford, Hon. Frederick	Herbert (Q.)	Jowett, Edmund ..
William		Kerby, Edwin Thomas
Bayley, James Garfield ..	Oxley (Q.)	John
Bell, George John ..	Darwin (T.)	Lamond, Hector ..
Bost, Hon. Sir Robert	Kooyong (V.)	Lavelle, Thomas James ..
Wallace, K.C.M.G.		Lazzarini, Hubert Peter ..
Blakeley, Arthur ..	Darling (N.S.W.)	Lister, John Henry ..
Blundell, Reginald Pole ..	Adelaide (S.A.)	Livingston, John ..
Bowden, Eric Kendall ..	Nepean (N.S.W.)	Mackay, George Hugh ..
Brennan, Frank ..	Batman (V.)	Mahon, Hon. Hugh ..
Bruce, Stanley Melbourne	Flinders (V.)	Mahony, William George ..
Burchell, Reginald John ..	Fremantle (W.A.)	Makin, Norman John
Catts, James Howard ..	Cook (N.S.W.)	Oswald
Cameron, Donald Charles	Brisbane (Q.)	Maloney, William ..
Chanter, Hon. John Moore	Riverina (N.S.W.)	Marks, Walter Moffitt ..
Chapman, Hon. Austin ..	Eden-Monaro	Marr, Charles William
	(N.S.W.)	Clanan
Charlton, Matthew ..	Hunter (N.S.W.)	Mathews, James ..
Considine, Michael Patrick	Barrier (N.S.W.)	Maxwell, George Arnot ..
Cook, Right Hon. Sir	Parramatta	McDonald, Hon. Charles ..
Joseph, P.C., G.C.M.G.	(N.S.W.)	McWilliams, William James
Cook, Robert ..	Indi (V.)	Franklin (T.)
Corser, Edward Bernard	Wide Bay (Q.)	Moloney, Parker John ..
Cresset		Nicholls, Samuel Robert ..
Cunningham, Lucien	Gwydir (N.S.W.)	Macquarie (N.S.W.)
Lawrence		Page, Earle Christmas
Fenton, James Edward ..	Maribyrnong (V.)	Cowper (N.S.W.)
Fleming, William Mont-	Robertson (N.S.W.)	Grafton
gomerie		Page, Hon. James ..
Foster, Hon. Richard	Wakefield (S.A.)	Poynton, Hon. Alexander
Witty		Grey (S.A.)
Fowler, Hon. James	Perth (W.A.)	Prowse, John Henry ..
Mackinnon		Swan (W.A.)
Francis, Frederick Henry ..	Henty (V.)	Riley, Edward ..
Gabb, Joel Moses ..	Angas (S.A.)	(N.S.W.)
Gibson, William Gerrard	Corangamite (V.)	Rodgers, Arthur Stanis-
Greene, Hon. Walter	Richmond (N.S.W.)	Wannon (V.)
Massy		laus
Gregory, Hon. Henry ..	Dampier (W.A.)	Ryan, Hon. Thomas
Groom, Hon. Littleton	Darling Downs (Q.)	West Sydney
Ernest		Joseph
Hay, Alexander ..	New England	Ryrie, Sir Granville de
	(N.S.W.)	North Sydney
Higgs, Hon. William Guy	Capricornia (Q.)	Laune, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
Hill, William Caldwell ..	Echuca (V.)	V.D.
Hughes, Right Hon.	Bendigo (V.)	Smith, Hon. William
William Morris, P.C.,		Denison (T.)
K.C.		Henry Laird ..
Jackson, David Sydney ..	Bass (T.)	Stewart, Percy Gerald ..
		Wimmera (V.)
		Story, William Harrison ..
		Boothby (S.A.)
		Tudor, Hon. Frank Gwynne
		Yarra (V.)
		Watkins, Hon. David ..
		Newcastle (N.S.W.)
		Watt, Right Hon. William
		Balaclava (V.)
		Alexander, P.C.
		West, John Edward ..
		East Sydney
		(N.S.W.)
		Wienholt, Arnold ..
		Mereton (Q.)
		Wise, Hon. George (Henry
		Gippsland (V.)

1. Sworn 27th February, 1920. — 2. Sworn 3rd March, 1920. — 3. Appointed Temporary Chairman of Committees.
4th March, 1920. — 4. Made affirmation 5th March, 1920.

HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS.

Senate.—C. G. Duffy, C.M.G.

House of Representatives.—W. A. Gale.

Parliamentary Reporting Staff.—B. H. Friend.

Library.—A. Wadsworth.

Joint House Committee.—G. H. Monahan.



3 0112 115348515

CONTENTS—continued.

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATE, 29 APRIL.		Duty on Medicines	1612
War Gratuity Bill	1575	Military Pay	1612
Visit of Prince of Wales: Amnesty to Military and Naval Prisoners	1575	Military Offices	1613
Waterside Workers: Inquiry into Conditions of Employment	1576	Export of Wool	1613
War Service Homes	1576	Totalisator Tax	1613
Public Works Committee	1577	Visit of the Prince of Wales.—Expenditure—	
Public Accounts Committee	1577	Theatrical Entertainments	1613
Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill	1577	Conferring of Honours	1614
Immigration Bill	1597	Correction of Marine Chart	1614
Passports Bill.—Second Reading	1597	Remittances to Germany	1614
Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill	1602	Queensland Income Tax: Commonwealth War Loans	1614
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 29 APRIL.		Old-age Pensions Expenditure	1614
War Service Homes: South Australian Branch	1603	Proposed Constitutional Convention	1614
Increase of Rents	1603	Public Service Superannuation	1615
Public Accounts Committee	1603	Wheat Scrip Advances—Ending of Wheat Pool	1615
Industrial Convention	1604	Public Servants on Active Service and Commonwealth Bank Officers	1615
Northern Territory: Report of Royal Commission	1604	Australian Wool Clips.—Imperial Contract: Production of Papers	1615
Parliamentary Officers: Payment of Non-Clerical Staff	1604	Overseas Mail Service	1616
Wheat Pool	1604	Sub-Collector of Customs, Broken Hill	1616
Note Issue	1604	Tanunda Club	1617
Tweed for Soldiers	1604	Amendment of the Constitution: Election of Constitutional Convention	1617
Adjournment (<i>Formal</i>).—Dismissal of Returned Soldiers at Victoria Barracks, Sydney	1604	Broken Hill Mining Industry	1623
Postmaster-General's Department: Second Furlough Period	1611	Suspension of Sitting	1639
Secret Service Fund	1612	Joint Standing Committees	1639
Generation of Electricity by Tidal Power	1612	Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Bill	1639
		Australian Imperial Force Canteens Funds Bill.—Second Reading	1639
		Postponement of Judiciary Bill	1646

COMMITTEES.

SENATE

DISPUTED RETURNS AND QUALIFICATIONS.—Senator Barnes, Senator Keating, Senator Lynch, Senator Maughan, Senator O'Keefe, Senator Pratten, and Senator Senior.

STANDING ORDERS.—The President, the Chairman of Committees, Senator Barnes, Senator de Largie, Senator Foll, Senator Guthrie, Senator McDougall, Senator O'Keefe, and Senator Earle.

LIBRARY.—The President, Senator Bolton, Senator Gardiner, Senator Keating, Senator Lynch, Senator Maughan, and Senator Pratten.

HOUSE.—The President, Senator Bakhap, Senator Buzacott, Senator Guy, Senator O'Loughlin, Senator Needham, and Senator Rowell.

PRINTING.—Senator Barker, Senator Grant, Senator Guy, Senator Newland, Senator Plain, Senator Reid, and Senator Senior

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (JOINT).—Senator Crawford, Senator Earle, Senator McDougall.

PUBLIC WORKS (JOINT).—Senator Henderson, Senator Needham, Senator Newland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

STANDING ORDERS.—Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Fowler, and Mr. Tudor.

LIBRARY.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anstey, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Higgs, Mr. Lamond, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Maxwell, Dr. Maloney*, and Mr. McDonald.

HOUSE.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. W. Foster, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Mathews, Mr. James Page, Mr. Rodgers, and Mr. Watkins.

PRINTING.—Mr. Bamford, Mr. Bowden, Mr. Corser, Mr. Fenton, Mr. McWilliams, Mr. Riley, and Mr. West.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (JOINT).—Mr. Bayley, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Prowse, Mr. West.

PUBLIC WORKS (JOINT).—Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Bamford, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Parker Moloney.

SEA CARRIAGE: SELECT COMMITTEE.—Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Burchell, Mr. Corser, Mr. Foster, Mr. Mahony, Mr. McWilliams, and Mr. Watkins.

* Appointed 30th March, 1920.